



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 53V1 0

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH
HEBREW GRAMMAR

COLLINS AND COWLEY

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



LONDON, EDINBURGH, AND NEW YORK

GESENIUS' = HEBREW GRAMMAR

AS EDITED AND ENLARGED BY

E. KAUTZSCH

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE

TRANSLATED FROM THE TWENTY-FIFTH GERMAN EDITION

BY THE LATE

REV. G. W. COLLINS, M.A.

*THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND ADJUSTED
TO THE TWENTY-SIXTH EDITION*

BY

A. E. COWLEY, M.A.

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1898

c

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE MASS.

A 72.177

Oxford

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, M.A.

PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

364

Beseinius

(1000)

1000

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE Hebrew Grammar of William Gesenius—originally published in 1813—has long been regarded as a standard work in Germany, and has been repeatedly re-edited, first by Rödiger and afterwards by Professor Kautzsch, with a view to keeping it abreast of the progress of scholarship. Various English translations of it have also appeared; but the original work has gained so considerably in value in the latest editions, thanks to the scholarly revision of Professor Kautzsch, that the time seemed to have come for a new translation of what is practically a new book. Moreover, no Hebrew Grammar exists in English combining in one volume a thorough treatment both of the accidence and of the syntax. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press accordingly arranged with the German publisher, Herr Vogel, of Leipzig, to issue such a translation, and entrusted the work to the late Rev. G. W. Collins (of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Keble College, Oxford), with whom I was afterwards associated. His translation of the twenty-fifth edition (1889) was already approaching completion when a new edition of the German was announced as being in preparation, and the Delegates decided to await its publication in order that Professor Kautzsch's latest improvements might be incorporated in the English translation. The new German edition, however, did not appear so soon as was expected, and in the meantime Mr. Collins died. The task of revising the translation, and of seeing it through the press, thus devolved upon me. Its accomplishment has been somewhat

delayed, partly by the intervention of other work, and partly owing to the numerous additions and improvements introduced by Professor Kautzsch into the twenty-sixth edition (1896), which of course had to be incorporated. With regard to the method pursued, the plan and arrangement of the original have been strictly followed, so that the references for sections and paragraphs correspond exactly in German and English. At the same time, every effort has been made to state the principles of the grammar in a form that would be clearly and readily apprehended by English students. The sheets have been submitted while in proof to the Regius Professor of Hebrew, Dr. Driver, who has made numerous valuable suggestions as to translation. Some slight additions have occasionally been made—in no case, however, affecting the substance of Professor Kautzsch's work—chiefly consisting of supplementary references to English works, or now and then completing a list of citations. These have been enclosed within brackets [] wherever it was possible to do so without too much complication. A few notes added by Mr. Collins have been marked with his initials, G. W. C. Some evident printer's errors in the German have been tacitly corrected. It would be too much to hope that in so large a mass of details mistakes have been entirely avoided, but my endeavours to secure accuracy and uniformity have been very materially aided by the skill and experience of Mr. J. C. Pembrey, the oriental reader to the Clarendon Press. In conclusion, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Driver for his ever-ready help in all matters of difficulty, and for the encouragement I have received from him throughout a rather toilsome piece of work.

A. E. COWLEY.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

BETWEEN the appearance of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth editions of this Grammar¹ more than six years elapsed. During that period so many important works appeared on the textual criticism and exegesis of the Old Testament, as well as on the grammar of the Hebrew and other Semitic languages, that the editor again found abundant materials for amplifying and re-casting the work. . . .

For the Biblical text, constant use has been made of the critical editions of Dr. S. Baer: *Jeremia*, Lipsiae, 1890; *Josua et Judices*, 1891; *Samuel*, 1892; *Reges*, 1895. Warm praise is also due to the admirable edition of the Old Testament text by David Ginsburg (London, 1894, 2 vols.), based primarily on the earliest printed editions,—seven of the entire Bible, dated between 1488 and 1525, and thirteen of various parts, 1477–1525,—and containing a selection of readings from the LXX, Peshittâ, Targums, and Vulgate. In the course of his work, the present writer has learnt to value this edition more and more. The critically revised text in the handsome series of ‘Sacred Books of the Old Testament’², published under the editorship of Prof. P. Haupt (Leipzig and Baltimore, 1893, &c.), has also been consulted

¹ The first edition appeared at Halle in 1813 (pp. 202, small 8vo); the next thirteen editions were issued by Gesenius himself; the fifteenth to the twenty-first (1845–1872) by E. Rödiger; the twenty-second to the twenty-fifth (1878–1889) by the present editor.

² Distinguishing the various documents of the Pentateuch and historical books by colours, and hence also called the ‘Polychrome Bible.’ The following parts have appeared: Job by Siegfried, 1893; I and II Samuel by Budde, Leviticus by Driver and White, 1894; Jeremiah by Cornill, Joshua by Bennett, the Psalms by Wellhausen, Chronicles by Kittel, 1895; Genesis by Ball, Daniel by Kamphausen, 1896.

as occasion required. But this twenty-sixth edition has especially benefited by the systematic study of the Old Testament, undertaken with a view to the new translation of it, published by the editor in 1894¹. Independently of the criticism of the text, this afforded opportunity for a much fuller notice of all striking forms, as well as for considerable additions to the examples in the Syntax.

Among the works consulted on special grammatical questions, the first place must be assigned to those of De Lagarde, Barth, and Ed. König, cited on p. 231. König's Lehrgebäude, starting with Hebrew, includes a comprehensive comparison of the other Semitic dialects, and is distinguished by an almost exhaustive presentation of the facts, as well as by the regard paid systematically to phonetic and philological principles. De Lagarde and Barth, embracing in their survey the entire system of Semitic noun-formation, suggest, independently of each other, such an abundance of new and important points of view, that the editor felt no little embarrassment in deciding on the extent of the changes required in §§ 81–86, 93 and 94. However, the consideration that, in spite of very remarkable agreement on fundamental questions, the two scholars often differ widely in details, and that the controversy on the subject (see the literature on p. 231) has led to no definite conclusions, finally left no doubt as to the course to be pursued. I have endeavoured in an excursus (§ 83, *d*) to give, as far as possible, an unbiassed statement of the principles followed by both scholars, and in § 84 sqq. have altered or omitted whatever has so far been proved to be certainly untenable. Though starting with grave doubts, I must admit that Barth's fundamental principle—that all nouns may be referred to either perfect or imperfect stems—appears to me more and more to be correct and fruitful, although at the same time it is true that *all* nouns cannot now be traced to one or the other stem with the certainty claimed by the author in his *Nominalbildung*.

¹ *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894. Of the readings discussed in pp. 1 to 88 of the appendix to this translation, a considerable number have also been noticed in the Grammar.

Among smaller monographs the studies of Knudtzon, mentioned on p. 320, note, as also V. Baumann's *Hebräische Relativsätze* (see p. 466), Herner's *Syntax der Zahlwörter* (see p. 454), and Diehl's *Pronomen personale suffixum 2. und 3. plur. des Hebräischen*, deserve special mention. The last-named Dissertation was available only from § 91 onwards. Besides these, abundant material is contained in the numerous discussions of grammatical and syntactical questions in Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1890), and in the lists of the linguistic features of particular books in Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (sixth edition, Edinburgh, 1897), in Siegfried and Stade's *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum A. T.* (Leipzig, 1893), and last but not least in the greatly improved twelfth edition of Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch*, edited by Frants Buhl, with the assistance of A. Socin and H. Zimmern, in 1895. The sparing use of such valuable works as Friedrich Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik* (Berlin, 1889¹), P. Haupt's *Semitische Sprachlaute* (see p. 27), &c., was due to the limitations necessarily imposed by a Grammar intended primarily for theological students in the widest sense of the term. At the same time, the greatest possible care has been taken to give a full account of the literature which has appeared since 1889.

For notes and corrections relating to particular points, I have to thank Professors Budde (Strassburg), Dalman (Leipzig), Haupt (Baltimore), Kamphausen (Bonn), Ley (Kreuznach), G. Moore (Andover), Nestle (Ulm), Philippi (Rostock, in a review of the twenty-fifth edition in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1890, no. 17), Praetorius (Halle), Stade (Giessen), and Messrs. S. Preiswerk, junior (Bâle), and Ziegert (Breslau); also for notes on a more considerable scale, Dr. Mayer-Lambert (Paris), Prof. Socin (Leipzig), and Prof. Strack (Berlin). The two last-mentioned scholars placed at my disposal their own copies of the twenty-fifth edition, containing numerous marginal annotations. Lastly, I must pay a tribute of gratitude to the cherished memory of my friend Prof. August Müller (Halle). The criticisms,

¹ English translation, Berlin and London (Williams and Norgate), 1889.

x *From the Preface to the German Edition.*

which, according to the close of his review of the twenty-fifth edition, Prof. Müller intended for me, were found indicated in his private copy by lines and crosses of various colours. These led me in numerous cases to re-consider, and, I hope, also sometimes to improve the text.

In the correction of the proofs of the twenty-sixth edition, my young colleague Mr. Steuernagel deserves my thanks for his unwearied and skilful help.

.

The old complaint that reference to the Grammar was rendered difficult by the numerous subdivisions of the sections, has now been met by the addition of marginal letters. By this means the number of the section and one letter suffice for reference in nearly all cases. In very long sections (§§ 67, 72, 75, 93, 112, 113, 117, 119, 126, 159) double letters had to be used (*aa, bb, &c.*) after the single alphabet was exhausted. At the same time, the old subdivisions had to be retained on account of the numerous references in existing commentaries, and in the four editions of the Exercise Book.

Finally, the Paradigms (p. 536 sqq.) have been subjected to a very thorough revision for this edition. From Paradigm G onward forms not actually occurring have been enclosed within brackets.

The principal abbreviations used are—*ZDMG*=*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*: *ZAW*=*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (edited, since its commencement in 1881, by Prof. B. Stade, Giessen): *ZDPV*=*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins* (edited, since 1878, by Prof. H. Guthe, Leipzig).

E. KAUTZSCH.

Z. A. W.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TABLE OF EARLY SEMITIC ALPHABETS	xviii
SILOAM INSCRIPTION	xix

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The Semitic Languages in General	I
§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language	8
§ 3. Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language	17
§ 4. Division and Arrangement of the Grammar	21

FIRST PART.

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES, OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS.

CHAPTER I. THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS.

§ 5. The Consonants : their Form and Names	23
§ 6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants	28
§ 7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs	33
§ 8. The Vowel Signs in particular	38
§ 9. Character of the several Vowels	42
§ 10. The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider (Š ^{wā})	49
§ 11. Other Signs which affect the Reading	53
§ 12. Dageš in general, and Dageš forte in particular	53
§ 13. Dageš lene	54
§ 14. Mappiq and Rāphè	55
§ 15. The Accents	56
§ 16. Of Maqqēph and Mèthēg	62
§ 17. Of the Q ^{ré} and K ^{thibh}	64

CHAPTER II. PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE SYLLABLE AND THE TONE.

§ 18. In general	66
§ 19. Changes of Consonants	66
§ 20. The Doubling (strengthening and sharpening) of Consonants	69

	PAGE
§ 21. The Aspiration of the Tenues	73
§ 22. Peculiarities of the Gutturals	75
§ 23. The Feebleness of the Aspirates \aleph and π	78
§ 24. Changes of the Weak Letters \imath and $\dot{\imath}$	81
§ 25. Firm or Immovable Vowels	83
§ 26. Syllable-formation and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels	84
§ 27. The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity .	87
§ 28. The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables	92
§ 29. The Tone, its Changes, and the Pause	94

SECOND PART.

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

§ 30. Stems and Roots : Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral .	99
§ 31. Grammatical Structure	104

CHAPTER I. THE PRONOUN.

§ 32. The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun	105
§ 33. Pronominal Suffixes	108
§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun	109
§ 35. The Article	110
§ 36. The Relative Pronoun	113
§ 37. The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns	113

CHAPTER II. THE VERB.

§ 38. General View	115
§ 39. Ground-form and Derived Stems	115
§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion	118
§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb . .	119

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42. In general	119
----------------------------	-----

A. The Pure Stem, or *Qal*.

§ 43. Its Form and Meaning	120
§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of <i>Qal</i>	120
§ 45. The Infinitive	124
§ 46. The Imperative	125
§ 47. The Imperfect and its Inflection	127
§ 48. Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative.	
The Jussive and Cohortative	131
§ 49. The Perfect and Imperfect with <i>Wāw</i> Consecutive . . .	135
§ 50. The Participle	138

Contents.

xiii

B. Verba Derivativa, or Derived Conjugations.

	PAGE
§ 51. Niph'al	139
§ 52. Pi'el and Pu'al	142
§ 53. Hiph'il and Hoph'al	147
§ 54. Hithpa'el	153
§ 55. Less Common Conjugations	155
§ 56. Quadrilaterals	158

C. Strong Verb with Pronominal Suffixes.

§ 57. In general	158
§ 58. The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb	159
§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes	162
§ 60. Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes	165
§ 61. Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes	167

Verbs with Gutturals.

§ 62. In general	169
§ 63. Verbs First Guttural	170
§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural	174
§ 65. Verbs Third Guttural	177

II. The Weak Verb.

§ 66. Verbs Primæ Radicalis Nûn (י'ד)	178
§ 67. Verbs י'י	181

The Weakest Verbs (Verba Quiescentia).

§ 68. Verbs נ'ד	190
§ 69. Verbs י'ד. First Class, or Verbs originally י'ד	193
§ 70. Verbs י'ד. Second Class, or Verbs properly י'ד	199
§ 71. Verbs י'ד. Third Class, or Verbs with Yôdh assimilated	200
§ 72. Verbs י'י (vulgo י'י)	201
§ 73. Verbs middle I (vulgo י'י)	210
§ 74. Verbs נ'י	213
§ 75. Verbs י'י	215
§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak	226
§ 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another	228
§ 78. Verba Defectiva	229

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN.

§ 79. General View	231
§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns	232
§ 81. Derivation of Nouns	235
§ 82. Primitive Nouns	235

	PAGE
§ 88. Verbal Nouns in General	236
§ 84 <i>a</i> . Nouns derived from the Simple Stem	238
§ 84 <i>b</i> . Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem	243
§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Afformatives	245
§ 86. Denominative Nouns	250
§ 87. Of the Plural	252
§ 88. Of the Dual	255
§ 89. The Genitive and the Construct State	258
§ 90. Probable Remains of Early Case-endings	259
§ 91. The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes	265
§ 92. Vowel Changes in the Noun	270
§ 93. Paradigms of Masculine Nouns	273
§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns	286
§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns	288
§ 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation	293
§ 97. Numerals. (<i>a</i>) Cardinal Numbers	298
§ 98. Numerals. (<i>b</i>) Ordinal Numbers	302

CHAPTER IV. THE PARTICLES.

§ 99. General View	304
§ 100. Adverbs	305
§ 101. Prepositions	308
§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions	309
§ 103. Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form	311
§ 104. Conjunctions	316
§ 105. Interjections	318

THIRD PART.

SYNTAX.

CHAPTER I. THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

I. Syntax of the Verb.

A. Use of the Tenses and Moods.

§ 106. Use of the Perfect	320
§ 107. Use of the Imperfect	325
§ 108. Use of the Cohortative	331
§ 109. Use of the Jussive	334
§ 110. The Imperative	337
§ 111. The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive	339
§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive	344

Contents.

xv

B. *The Infinitive and Participle.*

	PAGE
§ 113. The Infinitive Absolute	355
§ 114. The Infinitive Construct	363
§ 115. Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object	369
§ 116. The Participles	372

C. *The Government of the Verb.*

§ 117. The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative.	379
§ 118. The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb	391
§ 119. The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions.	395
§ 120. Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb. Co-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas	404
§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs	407

II. *Syntax of the Noun.*

§ 122. Indication of the Gender of the Noun	409
§ 123. The Representation of Plural Ideas by means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words	414
§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form	416
§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names	421
§ 126. Determination by means of the Article	424
§ 127. The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive.	431
§ 128. The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State	434
§ 129. Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution	439
§ 130. Wider Use of the Construct State	441
§ 131. Apposition	443
§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective	448
§ 133. The Comparison of Adjectives. (Periphrastic expression of the Comparative and Superlative)	450
§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals	454

III. *Syntax of the Pronoun.*

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun	459
§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun	464
§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun	466
§ 138. The Relative Pronoun	466
§ 139. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives	470

CHAPTER II. THE SENTENCE.

I. The Sentence in General.

	PAGE
§ 140. Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence	473
§ 141. The Noun-clause	474
§ 142. The Verbal-clause	478
§ 143. The Compound Sentence	481
§ 144. Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject (especially in the Verbal-clause)	483
§ 145. Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number	486
§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects	492
§ 147. Incomplete Sentences	494

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations	496
§ 149. Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration	497
§ 150. Interrogative Sentences	498
§ 151. Desiderative Sentences	501
§ 152. Negative Sentences	503
§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses	509
§ 154. Sentences connected by Wāw	509
§ 155. Relative Clauses	511
§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses	515
§ 157. Object-clauses	517
§ 158. Causal Clauses	518
§ 159. Conditional Sentences	519
§ 160. Concessive Clauses	525
§ 161. Comparative Clauses	526
§ 162. Disjunctive Sentences	527
§ 163. Adversative and Exceptive Clauses	527
§ 164. Temporal Clauses	528
§ 165. Final Clauses	530
§ 166. Consecutive Clauses	532
§ 167. Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, Involved Series of Sentences	532
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	534
PARADIGMS	535
INDEX OF SUBJECTS, AND OF HEBREW WORDS	559
INDEX OF PASSAGES	567

EARLY SEMITIC ALPHABETS.

Mēša' in- scription early 9th cent. B.C. § 2. d, § 5. a.	Phoenician coins and inscrip- tions.	Neo- panic.	Old Hebrew coins and gems.	Sama- ritan.	Egyptian- Aramaic 5th to 1st cent. B.C.	Palmyrene 1st cent. B.C. to 4th cent. A.D.	Hebrew in- scriptions beginning of 1st cent. A.D.	Square charac- ter.	Rashi.
𐤀	𐤁	𐤂	𐤃	𐤄	𐤅	𐤆	𐤇	𐤈	א
𐤉	𐤊	𐤋	𐤌	𐤍	𐤎	𐤏	𐤐	𐤑	ב
𐤒	𐤓	𐤔	𐤕	𐤖	𐤗	𐤘	𐤙	𐤚	ג
𐤛	𐤜	𐤝	𐤞	𐤟	𐤠	𐤡	𐤢	𐤣	ד
𐤤	𐤥	𐤦	𐤧	𐤨	𐤩	𐤪	𐤫	𐤬	ה
𐤭	𐤮	𐤯	𐤰	𐤱	𐤲	𐤳	𐤴	𐤵	ו
𐤶	𐤷	𐤸	𐤹	𐤺	𐤻	𐤼	𐤽	𐾀	ז
𐾁	𐾂	𐾃	𐾄	𐾅	𐾆	𐾇	𐾈	𐾉	ח
𐾊	𐾋	𐾌	𐾍	𐾎	𐾏	𐾐	𐾑	𐾒	ט
𐾓	𐾔	𐾕	𐾖	𐾗	𐾘	𐾙	𐾚	𐾛	י
𐾜	𐾝	𐾞	𐾟	𐾠	𐾡	𐾢	𐾣	𐾤	כ
𐾥	𐾦	𐾧	𐾨	𐾩	𐾪	𐾫	𐾬	𐾭	ך
𐾮	𐾯	𐾰	𐾱	𐾲	𐾳	𐾴	𐾵	𐾶	ל
𐾷	𐾸	𐾹	𐾺	𐾻	𐾼	𐾽	𐾾	𐾿	ם
𐿀	𐿁	𐿂	𐿃	𐿄	𐿅	𐿆	𐿇	𐿈	נ
𐿉	𐿊	𐿋	𐿌	𐿍	𐿎	𐿏	𐿐	𐿑	ס
𐿒	𐿓	𐿔	𐿕	𐿖	𐿗	𐿘	𐿙	𐿚	ע
𐿛	𐿜	𐿝	𐿞	𐿟	𐿠	𐿡	𐿢	𐿣	פ
𐿤	𐿥	𐿦	𐿧	𐿨	𐿩	𐿪	𐿫	𐿬	צ
𐿭	𐿮	𐿯	𐿰	𐿱	𐿲	𐿳	𐿴	𐿵	ק
𐿶	𐿷	𐿸	𐿹	𐿺	𐿻	𐿼	𐿽	𐿾	ר
𐿿	𐾀	𐾁	𐾂	𐾃	𐾄	𐾅	𐾆	𐾇	ש
𐾈	𐾉	𐾊	𐾋	𐾌	𐾍	𐾎	𐾏	𐾐	ת

HEBREW GRAMMAR.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Semitic Languages in General.*

SEE Gesenius, Introduction to his *Hebr. Handwörterb.*, 2nd to 10th editions; E. Renan, *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*, 3rd ed., Paris, 1863; B. Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gramm.*, Lpz. 1879, § 2 sqq.; E. König, *Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Spr.*, Lpz. 1881, § 3; H. Strack, 'Einl. in das A. T.', in Zöckler's *Handb. der theol. Wissenschaften*, Nördl. 1883, i. 190 sqq.; 4th ed. Munich, 1895; F. Hommel, *Die semit. Völker u. Sprachen*, Lpz. 1883, i. 1; Th. Nöldeke, article 'Semitic Languages,' in the 9th ed. of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, in German with corrections and additions, *Die semit. Sprachen*, Lpz. 1887; W. Wright, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Cambr. 1890. Much relating to the subject may also be found in Diestel's *Gesch. des A. T. in der christl. Kirche*, Jena, 1869.—The material contained in inscriptions has been in process of collection since 1881 in the *Paris Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*.

1. The Hebrew language is one branch of a great family of languages in Western Asia which was indigenous in Palestine, Phoenicia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Assyria, and Arabia, that is to say, in the countries extending from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the Mountains of Armenia to the southern coast of Arabia. In early times, however, it spread from Arabia over Abyssinia, and by means of Phoenician colonies over many islands and sea boards of the Mediterranean, as for instance to the Carthaginian coast. No comprehensive designation is found in early times for the languages and nations of this family; the name *Semites* or *Semitic languages* (based upon the fact that according to Gen. 10, 21 sqq. almost all nations speaking these languages are descended from Shem) is however now generally accepted and has accordingly been retained here ¹.

¹ From Shem are derived (Gen. 10, 21 sqq.) the Aramaean and Arab families as well as the Hebrews, but not the Canaanites (Phoenicians) who are traced back to Ham (vv. 6, 15 sqq.), although their language belongs decidedly to what

b 2. The better known Semitic languages may be subdivided as follows :—

I. The South Semitic or Arabic branch. To this belong, besides the classical literary language of the Arabs and the modern vulgar Arabic, the older southern Arabic preserved in the Sabæan inscriptions (less correctly called Himyaritic), and its offshoot, the Ge'ez or Ethiopic, in Abyssinia.

II. The Middle Semitic or Canaanitish branch. To this belongs the Hebrew of the Old Testament with its descendants, the New Hebrew, as found especially in the Mishna (see below, § 3. 1) and Rabbinic; also Phœnician with Punic (in Carthage and its colonies) and the various remains of Canaanitish dialects preserved in names of places and persons, and in the inscription of Mēša', king of Moab.

c III. The North Semitic or Aramaic branch. The subdivisions of this are—(1) The Eastern Aramaic or Syriac, the literary language of the Christian Syrians. The religious books of the Mandæans (Nasoræans, Sabians, also called the disciples of St. John) represent a very debased offshoot of this. A Jewish modification of Syriac is to be seen in the language of the Babylonian Talmud. (2) The Western or Palestinian Aramaic, incorrectly called also 'Chaldee.' This latter dialect is represented in the Old Testament by two words in Gen. 31, 47, by the verse Jer. 10, 11, and the sections Dan. 2, 4—7, 28; Ezr. 4, 8—6, 18, and 7, 12—26, as well as by a considerable portion of Jewish literature (Targums, Palestinian Gemara, &c.). To the same branch belongs also the Samaritan, with its admixture of Hebrew forms, and, except for the rather Arabic colouring of the proper names, the idiom of the so-called Nabataean inscriptions in the Sinaitic peninsula, in the East of Palestine, &c.

For further particulars about the remains of Western Aramaic (including those in the New Test., in the Palmyrene and Egyptian Aramaic inscriptions) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, Lpz. 1884, p. 6 sqq.

d IV. The East Semitic branch¹, the language of the Assyrio-

is now called Semitic. The language of the Babylonians and Assyrians, about which uncertainty long prevailed, has proved to be Semitic, just as Akkūr (Gen. 10, 22) is included among the sons of Shem.

¹ Cf. especially Hommel, 'On the philological position of the Ass.-Babylonian as compared with Western Semitic,' in *Aufsätze u. Abhandlungen arabistisch semitologischen Inhalts*, Munich, 1892, p. 92 sqq.

Babylonian inscriptions, the third line of the Achaemenian inscriptions.

On the importance of Assyrian for Hebrew philology especially from a lexicographical point of view comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *The Hebrew Language viewed in the light of Assyrian research*, Lond. 1883, and *Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuchs zum A. T.*, Lpz. 1886; P. Haupt, 'Assyrian Phonology, &c.,' in *Hebraica*, Chicago, Jan. 1885, vol. i. 3; Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, Berlin, 1889.

If the above division into four branches be reduced to two principal groups, No. I, as South Semitic, will be contrasted with the three North Semitic branches.

All these languages stand to one another in much the same relation as those of the Germanic family (Gothic, Old Norse, Danish, Swedish; High and Low German in their earlier and later dialects), or as the Slavonic languages (Lithuanian, Lettish; Old Slavonic, Serbian, Russian; Polish, Bohemian). They are now either wholly extinct, as the Phoenician and Assyrian, or preserved only in a debased form, as Neo-Syriac among Syrian Christians and Jews in Mesopotamia and Kurdistan, Ethiopic (Ge'ez) in the later Abyssinian dialects (Tigré, Amharic), and Hebrew among some modern Jews (except in so far as they attempt a literary reproduction of the language of the Old Testament). Arabic alone has not only occupied to this day its original abode in Arabia proper, but has also forced its way in all directions into the domain of other languages.

The Semitic family of languages is bounded on the East and North by another of still wider extent, which reaches from India to the western limits of Europe, and is called Indo-Germanic, since it comprises, in the most varied ramifications, the Indian (Sanskrit), Old and New Persian, Greek, Latin, Slavonic as well as Gothic, along with the other Germanic languages. With the Old Egyptian language, of which Coptic is a descendant, as well as with the languages of north-western Africa, the Semitic had from the earliest times much in common, especially in grammatical structure; but on the other hand there are fundamental differences between them, especially from a lexicographical point of view; see C. Abel, *Einleitung in ein ägyptisch-semitisch-indo-europäisches Wurzelwörterbuch*, Lpz. 1887; and *Ueber Wechselbeziehungen der ägyptischen, indo-europäischen u. semitischen Etymologie*, Lpz. 1889, pt. i; Hommel, 'On the extent of the relation between ancient Egyptian and Semitic,' in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii. 342 sqq.; Erman, *Das Verhältnis des Aegyptischen zu den semitischen Sprachen*, in the *ZDMG*. xlii, 1892, p. 93 sqq.

3. The grammatical structure of the Semitic family of languages, *f* as compared with that of other languages, especially the Indo-Germanic, exhibits numerous peculiarities which collectively constitute its distinctive character, although many of them are found singly in other languages. These are—(a) among the consonants, which in fact form the substance of these languages, occur peculiar gutturals of different grades; the vowels proceeding from the three primary sounds (*a, i, u*)

are subject, within the same consonantal frame-work, to great changes in order to express various modifications in the signification of the same stem; (*b*) the word-stems are almost invariably trilateral, i. e. composed of three consonants; (*c*) the verb is restricted to two tense-forms, with a peculiarly regulated use; and (*d*) the noun has only two genders (masc. and fem.); and peculiar expedients are adopted for the purpose of indicating the case-relations; (*e*) the oblique cases of the personal pronoun, as well as of all the possessive pronouns and the pronominal object of the verb, are denoted by forms immediately attached (suffixes); (*f*) the almost complete absence of compounds both in the noun (with the exception of many proper names) and in the verb; (*g*) great simplicity in the expression of syntactical relations, e. g. the small number of particles, and the prevalence of simple co-ordination of clauses without periodic structure. Classical Arabic, however, forms a not unimportant exception as regards the last mentioned point.

g 4. From a lexicographical point of view also the vocabulary of the Semites differs essentially from that of the Indo-Germanic languages, although there is here apparently more agreement than in the grammar. A considerable number of Semitic roots and stems¹ agree in sound with synonyms in the Indo-Germanic family. But apart from expressions directly borrowed (see below), the actual similarity might be restricted to imitative words (onomatopoeica), and to those in which one and the same idea is represented by similar sounds in consequence of a formative instinct common to the most varied families of language. Neither of these proves any *historic* or *generic* relation, to establish which an agreement in grammatical structure would also be necessary.

Comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Studien über indogermanisch-semitische Wurzel-verwandschaft*, Lpz. 1873; Nöldechen, *Semit. Glossen zu Fick und Curtius*, Magdeb. 1876 sq.; McCurdy, *Aryo-Semitic Speech*, Andover, U. S. A., 1881.

h As onomatopoeic words, or as stem-sounds of a similar character, we may compare, e. g. לָקַח, לִיחַ, לֵיחַ, *leíxw*, *lingo*, Sans. *lih*, Eng. *to lick*, Fr. *lécher*, Germ. *lecken*; לָלַח (kindr. לָלַח, לֵלַח) κίλλω, κέλλω, κυλίω, *volvo*, Germ. *quellen*, *wallen*, Eng. *to well*; גָּרַח, גָּרַח, גָּרַח, *garárrw*, Pers. *khárdán*, Ital. *grattare*, Fr. *gratter*, Eng. *to grate*, *to scratch*, Germ. *kratzen*; פָּרַק *frango*, Germ. *brechen*, &c.; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A. T.'s*, Braunsch. 1881, p. 38, draws attention moreover to the Semitic equivalents for *earth*, *six*, *seven*, *horn*, *to sound*, *to measure*, *to mix*,

[¹ On the distinction between stems and roots, see § 30, Rem. 1 and 2.—G. W. C.]

to smell, to place, clear, to kneel, raven, goat, ox, &c. An example of a somewhat different kind is *am*, *ham* (*sam*), *gam*, *kam*, in the sense of the German *samt*, *zusammen*; in Hebrew סָמַךְ (from which סָמָךְ *people*, properly *assembly*), סָם (with) *samt*, סָם also, moreover, Arab. وَدَّعَ to collect; Pers. *ham*, *hamah* (at the same time); Sans. *amā* (with), Gk. ἀμα (ἀμφω), ὁμός, ὁμοῦ (ὁμοιος, ὁμαθός), and harder κοινός, Lat. *cum*, *cumulus*, *cunctus*; with the corresponding sibilant Sans. *sam*, Gk. σὺν, ξύν, ξυνός = κοινός, Goth. *sama*, Germ. *samt*, *sammeln*; but many of these instances are doubtful.

Essentially different from this internal connexion, is the occurrence of the same words in different languages, where one language has borrowed directly from the other. Such *loan-words* are—

(a) *In Hebr.*: some names of objects which were originally indigenous in Egypt, Persia or India, e.g. אֵרֶךְ Egyptian properly *aur āa*, the great river, Coptic *yaro* or *yero*¹, nearly always of the Nile; אֶרֶךְ (Egyptian) Nile-reed; פֶּרֶךְ (in Zend *pairidaēza*, circumvallation = παράδεισος) *pleasure-garden, park*; דָּרִיךְ *daric*, Persian gold coin; תְּרִיךְ *peacocks*, perhaps from the Malabar *tōgai* or *tōghai*. Some of these words are also found in Greek, as אֶרֶךְ (Sans. *kapti*) *ape*, κῆπος, κήβος; פֶּרֶךְ (Pers. *kirbās*, Sans. *karpāsa*) *cotton*, κάρπασος, *carbasus*.

(b) *In Greek, &c.*: some originally Semitic names of Asiatic products and articles of commerce, e.g. בִּרְיָן *būsos*, *byssus*; לִבְנָה *libanos*, *libanotis*, *incense*; קָנָה *kāna*, *kāna*, *canna*, *cane*; כֻּמְזִין *kūmzin*, *cuminum*, *cumin*; קַסְיָה *kassia*, *cassia*; כַּמְלוֹס *kāmlos*, *camelus*; עֶרְבֹן *ērbon*, *arrhabo*, *arrha*, *pledge*. Such transitions have probably been brought about chiefly by Phœnician trade. (Comp. A. Müller, 'Semitische Lehnwörter im älteren Griechisch,' in Bezenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indo-germ. Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1877, vol. i. p. 273 sqq.; E. Ries, *Quæ res et vocabula a gentibus semiticis in Græciam pervenerint*, Breslau, 1890; Muss-Arnolt, 'Semitic words in Greek and Latin,' in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, xxiii. p. 35 sqq.; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griech.*, Berlin, 1895; J. H. Bondi, *Dem hebr.-phönis. Sprachstamme angehör. Lehnwörter in hieroglyph. u. hieratischen Texten*, Lpz. 1886.)

5. No system of writing is ever so perfect as to be able to reproduce the sounds of a language in all their various shades, and the *writing of the Semites* has essentially one remarkable defect, viz. that only the consonants (which indeed form the substance of the language) are arranged in line as real letters², whilst of the vowels only the longer are indicated by representative consonants (comp. below, § 7). It was only later that special small marks (points or strokes below

¹ According to Delitzsch, however (*Prolegg.* 145, v. sup. p. 2), אֵרֶךְ is a genuine Semitic word.

² So also originally the Ethiopic writing, which afterwards represented the vowels by small appendages to the consonants, or by some other change in their form. On the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform writing, which likewise indicates the vowels, see p. 6, note 1, ad fin.

or above the consonants) were invented to represent to the eye all the vowels (see § 8). These are, however, superfluous for the practised reader, and are therefore often wholly omitted in Semitic manuscripts and printed texts. Semitic writing, moreover, almost invariably proceeds from right to left¹.

With the exception of the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform), all varieties of Semitic writing, although differing widely in some respects, are derived from one and the same original alphabet, now represented most faithfully by the characters used on the stele of Mêša', king of Moab (see below, § 2. 2), and in the old Phoenician inscriptions. The old Hebrew writing, as it appears on the oldest monument, the Siloam inscription (see below, § 2. 2), exhibits essentially the same character. The old Greek, and indirectly all European alphabets, are descended from the old Phoenician writing.

- l See the Table of Alphabets at the beginning of the Grammar, which shows the relations of the older varieties of Semitic writing to one another and especially the origin of the present Hebrew characters from their primitive forms. For a more complete view, see Gesenius' *Scripturae linguaeque Phoeniciae monumenta*, Lips. 1837, 4to, pt. i. p. 15 sqq., and pt. iii. tab. 1-5, also his article 'Paläographie' in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.* Sect. iii. Bd. 9. From numerous monuments since discovered, our knowledge of the Semitic characters, especially the Phoenician, has become considerably enlarged and more accurate. Comp. especially the Tables of De Vogüé in vol. xi. of the *Revue archéol.*, Paris, 1865, and in the *Mélanges d'archéologie orientale*, Paris, 1868, after p. 141; further Paul Schröder, *Die phönis. Sprache*, Halle, 1869, p. 75 sqq.; Lenormant, *Essai sur la propagation de l'Alphabet Phénicien dans l'ancien monde*, Paris, 1875, tom. i. 2^{me} éd. (to be used with some caution); Schlottmann, article 'Schrift u. Schriftzeichen' in Riehm's *Handwörterb. des bibl. Altert.*, p. 1434 sqq.; Isaac Taylor, *The Alphabet, &c.*, Lond. 1883, 2 vols.; Phil. Berger, *Histoire de l'écriture dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1891.—For the development of the Hebrew characters and the best Tables of Alphabets, comp. § 5. a, note 2.

- m 6. As regards the relative age of the Semitic languages, the oldest writings are to be met with in the Assyrio-Babylonian (cuneiform) inscriptions²; with which are to be classed the earliest Hebrew fragments occurring in the Old Testament (see § 2).

¹ The Sabaeen (Himyaritic) writing runs occasionally from left to right, and even alternately in both directions (*boustrophedon*), but as a rule from right to left. In Ethiopic writing the direction from left to right has become the prevailing one; some few old inscriptions exhibit, however, the opposite direction. The cuneiform writing also runs from left to right, but this is undoubtedly borrowed from a non-Semitic people.

² Comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolagomena*, p. 57, 'We possess written monuments of

The Jewish-Aramaic writings begin about the time of Cyrus (comp. Ezr. 6, 3 sqq.), those of the Arabic branch first appear in the earliest centuries A.D. (Sabæan inscriptions, Ethiopic translation of the Bible in the fourth to fifth century, North-Arabic literature from the sixth century A.D.) It is, however, another question which of these languages has adhered longest and most faithfully to the original character of the Semitic, and which consequently represents to us the earliest phase of its development. For the more or less rapid transformation of the sounds and forms of a language, as spoken by nations and races, is dependent on causes quite distinct from the growth of a literature, and oftentimes the organic structure of a language is even considerably impaired before it has developed a literature, especially by early contact with people of a strange tongue. Thus in the Semitic department, the Aramaic dialects exhibit the earliest and greatest decay, next to them the Hebrew-Canaanitish, and in its own way the Assyrian. Arabic, owing to the seclusion of the desert tribes, was the longest to retain the original fullness and purity of the sounds and forms of words¹. Even here, however, there appeared, through the revolutionary influence of Islam, an ever-increasing decay, until Arabic at length reached nearly the stage at which we find Hebrew as early as the Old Testament.

the Assyrian kings Isme-Dagan and Samsi-Ramman I, who reigned about 1830 or 1816 B. C.: but Babylonian antiquities and Babylonian literature precede the Assyrian by a development of more than a thousand years.' According to Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, i. p. 11 sqq., the inscriptions found at Nippur embrace the period from 3800 to 450 B. C.

¹ Even now the language of some of the Bédawi is much purer and more archaic than that of the town-Arabs. It must, however, here be admitted that the former exalted estimate of the primitiveness of Arabic has been moderated in many respects by the most recent school of Semitic philology. Much apparently original is to be regarded with Nöldeke (*Die semit. Spr.* p. 5 [= *Encycl. Brit.*, ed. 9, art. SEMITIC LANGUAGES, p. 642]) only as a modification of the original. The assertion that the Arabs exhibit the Semitic character in its purest form, should, according to Nöldeke, be rather that 'the inhabitants of the desert lands of Arabia, under the influence of the extraordinarily monotonous scenery and of a life continually the same amid continual change, have emphasized some of the most important Semitic characteristics in a most one-sided manner.'

[In modern conversational Arabic, the Tënwin and the endings of inflectional forms are almost always neglected. Mr. E. T. Rogers, late British Consul at Cairo, told me that they are still pronounced in the neighbourhood of Timbuctoo.—G. W. C.]

72 Hence the phenomenon, that in its grammatical structure the ancient Hebrew agrees more with the modern than with the ancient Arabic, and that the latter, although it only appears as a written language at a later period, has yet in many respects preserved a more complete structure and a more original vowel system than the other Semitic languages. Thus it occupies amongst these a position similar to that which Sanskrit holds among the Indo-Germanic languages, or Gothic in the narrower circle of the Germanic. But even the toughest organism of a language often deteriorates, at least in single forms and derivatives, while on the contrary, in the midst of what is otherwise universal decay, there still remains here and there something original and archaic, and this is the case with the Semitic languages.

Fuller proof of the above statements belongs to the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages. It follows, however, from what has been said: (1) that the Hebrew language, as found in the sacred literature of the Jews, has, in respect to its organic structure, already suffered more considerable losses than the Arabic, which appears much later on the historical horizon; (2) that, notwithstanding this fact, we cannot at once and in all points concede the priority to the latter; (3) that it is a mistake to consider with some that the Aramaic, on account of its simplicity (which was only caused by the decay of its organic structure), is the oldest form of Semitic speech.

§ 2. Sketch of the History of the Hebrew Language.

See Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache u. Schrift*, Lpz. 1815, §§ 5-18; Th. Nöldeke's article, 'Sprache, hebräische,' in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, Lpz. 1875, Bd. v; Bertheau, 'Hebräische Sprache,' in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, 2. Aufl. Bd. 5; W. Robertson Smith, 'Hebrew Language and Literature,' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed., Edinb. 1880, vol. xi. p. 594 sqq.

a 1. The name *Hebrew Language* usually denotes the language of the sacred writings of the Israelites which form the canon of the *Old Testament*. It is also called *Ancient Hebrew* in contradistinction to the Neo-Hebrew in Jewish writings of the post-biblical period (§ 3. 1). The name Hebrew language (לְשׁוֹן עִבְרִית ἡρώσσα τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἑβραϊστί) does not occur in the Old Testament itself. Instead of it we find in Is. 19, 18 the term *language of Canaan*¹, and יְהוּדִית in the *Jews' language* 2 Ki. 18, 26. 28 (comp. Is. 36, 11. 13), Neh. 13, 24. In the last-cited passage it already agrees with the later (post-exilic) usage, which gradually extended the name *Jews*, *Jewish* to the whole nation, as in Haggai, Nehemiah, and the book of Esther.

b The distinction between the names *Hebrews* (עִבְרִים Ἑβραῖοι) and *Israelites* (יִשְׂרָאֵלִים) is that the latter was rather a national name of honour, with also

¹ That Hebrew in its present form was actually developed in Canaan appears from such facts as the use of *yam* (sea) for the west, *négub* (properly dryness, afterwards as a proper name for the south of Palestine) for the south, comp. Renss, l. c., p. 53 sq.

a religious significance, employed by the people themselves, while the former appears as the less significant name by which the nation was known amongst foreigners. Hence in the Old Testament *Hebrews* are only spoken of either when the name is employed by themselves as contrasted with foreigners (Gen. 40, 15. Ex. 2, 7. 3, 18 and elsewhere; Jon. 1, 9) or when it is put in the mouth of those who are not Israelites (Gen. 39, 14. 17. 41, 12 and elsewhere) or, finally, when it is used in opposition to other nations (Gen. 14, 13. 43, 32. Ex. 2, 11. 13. 21, 2). Its use in 1 Sam. 13, 3. 7 and 14, 21 is exceptional. In the Greek and Latin authors, as well as in Josephus, the name Ἑβραῖοι, *Hebraei*¹, &c., alone occurs. Of the many explanations of the gentile עִבְרִי, the derivation from עֵבֶר *a country on the other side* with the derivative suffix ' (§ 86. 2, 5) appears to be the only one philologically possible. The name accordingly denoted the Israelites as being those who inhabited the 'eber, i. e. the district on the other side of the Euphrates (or perhaps more correctly the Jordan?), and would therefore originally be only appropriate when used by the nations on this side of the Euphrates or Jordan. We must, then, suppose that after the crossing of either river it had been retained (by the Abrahamidae) as an old-established name, and within certain limits (see above) had become naturalized among them. In referring this name to the patronymic 'Eber, the Hebrew genealogists have assigned to it a much more comprehensive signification. For since in Gen. 10, 21 (Num. 24, 24 does not apply) Shem is called the *ancestor of all the children of 'Eber*, and to the latter there also belonged according to Gen. 22, 20 sqq. and 10, 25 sqq. Aramean and Arab races, the name, afterwards restricted in the form of the gentile 'ibri, exclusively to the Israelites, must have originally included a decidedly larger variety of countries and nations. The etymological significance of the name must in that case not be insisted upon.

The term Ἑβραϊστί is first used, to denote the old Hebrew, in the prologue ^c to Jesus the son of Sirach (about 130 B.C.), and in the New Testament, Rev. 9, 11. On the other hand it serves in John 5, 2. 19, 13. 17 perhaps also 19, 20 and Rev. 16, 16 to denote what was then the vernacular (Aramaic) of Palestine as opposed to the Greek. The meaning of the expression Ἑβραῖς διὰλεκτος in Acts 21, 40. 22, 2 and 26, 14 is doubtful (comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 19 sq.). Josephus also uses the term *Hebrew* both of the old Hebrew and the Aramaic vernacular of his time.

The Hebrew language is first called the *sacred language* in the Jewish-Aramaic versions of the Old Testament for the language of the sacred books in opposition to the *lingua profana*, i. e. the Aramaic vulgar tongue.

2. With the exception of the Old Testament (and apart from ^d the Phœnician inscriptions; see below, § 2. 3), only very few remains of old Hebrew or old Canaanitish literature have been preserved. Of the latter—(1) an inscription, unfortunately much injured, of thirty-four lines, which was found in the ancient territory of the tribe of Reuben, about twelve miles to the east of the Dead Sea, among the

¹ The Graeco-Roman form of the name is not directly derived from the Hebrew עִבְרִי, but from the Palestinian Aramaic 'ebriyā, 'the Hebrew.'

ruins of the city of Dîbôn (now Dhîbân), inhabited in earlier times by the Gadites, afterwards by the Moabites. In it, the Moabite king Mêša' (at the beginning of the ninth century B.C.) recounts his battles with Israel (comp. 2 Ki. 3, 4 sqq.), his buildings, and other matters¹; of old Hebrew (2) an inscription of six lines (probably of the eighth century B.C.²) discovered in June, 1880, in the tunnel between the Virgin's Spring and the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem; (3) twenty engraved seal-stones, some of them pre-exilic but bearing little except proper names³; (4) coins of the Maccabæan prince John Hyrkanus (from 135 B.C.) and his successors⁴, and the coinage of the revolts in the times of Vespasian and Hadrian.

¹ This monument, unique of its kind, was first seen in August, 1868, on the spot, by the German missionary F. A. Klein. It was afterwards broken into pieces by the Arabs, so that only an incomplete copy of the inscription could be made. Most of the fragments are now in the Louvre in Paris. Comp. Ch. Clermont-Ganneau (at that time head of the French consulate in Jerusalem), *La stèle de Mesa roi de Moab*, Paris, 1870, and 'La stèle de Dhîban,' in the *Revue Archéol.*, March, 1870, p. 184 sqq. (with an improved copy), also the *Journal Asiat.*, 1887, p. 72 sqq. Comp. for the history of the discovery and for the earlier literature relating to the stone, especially the article in *Ausland*, 1874, No. 48, p. 951 sqq. A photograph of the two largest fragments was prepared by the Palestine Exploration Fund from drawings by Sir C. Warren. All preceding facsimiles are now, however, antiquated, owing to the excellent reproduction and translation of the inscription by Sæmnd and Soçin, who from the fragments of the stone, and the squeeze taken in 1869 before its destruction, have established about eighty new characters (Freiburg im Baden, 1886). Cf. also Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890, p. lxxv sqq.

² Comp. for this inscription—unfortunately not dated, but linguistically and palaeographically very important—which refers to the boring of the tunnel, Kautsch in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palestina-Vereins*, 1881, pp. 102 sqq. and 260 sqq. (with a copy from a plaster-cast of the inscription), also 1882, p. 205 sqq.; Guthe, *ibid.* 1881, p. 250 sqq. and *ZDMG.* 1882, p. 725 sqq.; W. Wright in the *Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archaeol.*, Feb. 7, 1882; J. Derenbourg in the *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscriptions*, 1881, tom. iv, and in the *Revue des études Juives*, 1881, Parts 3 and 4; in the *Oriental Series of the London Palaeographical Soc.*, Plate 87; Beswick in the *Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Explor. Fund*, Oct. 1884. The inscription was removed in 1890, and broken into six or seven pieces in the process: v. Guthe in *ZDPV.* xiii. 286 sqq. If, as can hardly be doubted, the name מִשְׁכָּן (i.e. *emissio*) Is. 8, 6 refers to the discharge of water from the Virgin's Spring, through the tunnel (so Stade, *Gesch. Isr.* p. 594), then the latter, and consequently the inscription, was already in existence about 736 B.C.

³ See Rödiger in *ZDMG.* iii, 1849, pp. 243 and 347; de Vogüé, *Mélanges d'archéologie orientale*, Par. 1868, pp. 131-140; M. A. Levy, *Siegel u. Gemmen, &c.*, Bresl. 1869, p. 33 sqq.

⁴ De Saulcy, *Recherches sur la numismatique judaïque*, Paris, 1854, and his

3. In the whole series of the ancient Hebrew writings, as found ^e in the Old Testament and also in non-biblical monuments (see above, § 2. 2), the language (to judge from its consonantal formation) remains, as regards its general character, and apart from slight changes in form and differences in style (see letters *b* to *w*), at about the same stage of development. In this form, it may at an early time have been fixed as a literary language, and the fact that the books contained in the Old Testament were handed down as sacred writings, must have contributed to this constant uniformity.

To this old Hebrew, the language of the Canaanitish or Phoenician¹ stocks ^f came the nearest of all the Semitic languages, as is evident partly from the many Canaanitish names of persons and places with a Hebrew form and signification which occur in the Old Testament (e.g. מִלְכִּירָעָם, קִרְיַת סֶפֶר, &c.; on 'Canaanite glosses' to Assyrian words in the cuneiform tablets of Tell-el-Amarna [fourteenth century B.C.] cf. Zimmern, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1891, p. 154 sqq.²), and partly from the extant remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages.

The latter we find in their peculiar writing (§ 1. 5) in a great number of inscriptions and on coins, copies of which have been collected by Gesenius, *Monum. Phoenicia*, Judas, Bourgade, Davis, de Vogüé, Levy, P. Schröder, v. Maltzan, Euting, but especially in Part I of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 sqq., edited by the Paris Academy of Inscriptions. Among the inscriptions but few public documents are found, e.g. two lists of fees for sacrifices; by far the most are epitaphs or votive tablets. Of special importance is the inscription on the Sarcophagus of King Esmūnazar of Sidon, found in 1856, now in the Louvre; first accurately reproduced in *Mémoire sur le sarcophage et l'inscription funéraire d'Esmunazar, roi de Sidon*, Paris, 1856, by the Duc de Luynes; fully explained by Schlottmann, Halle, 1868, and by Kaempf, Prague, 1874; comp. also the reproduction in the *Corpus Inscr. Semit.*, tom. i, fasc. 1. To these may be added isolated words in Greek and Latin authors, and the Punic texts in Plautus, *Poenulus* 5, 1-3 (best treated by Gildemeister in Ritschl's edition of Plautus, Lips. 1884, tom. ii, fasc. 5). From those monuments we learn the native orthography, from the Greek and Latin transcriptions the pronunciation and vocalization; the two together give a tolerably distinct idea of this language and its relation to Hebrew.

Numismatique de la terre sainte, Par. 1874; M. A. Levy, *Gesch. der jüd. Münzen*, Breslau, 1862; Madden, *History of Jewish Coinage*, Lond. 1864, and *The Coins of the Jews*, Lond. 1881 (vol. ii. of the *International Numismat. Orient.*); Reinach, *Les monnaies juives*, Paris, 1888.—Comp. the literature in Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.*, Lpz. 1890, i. p. 17 sqq.

¹ קִנְזָנִי, קִנְזָנִי is the native name, common both to the Canaanitish tribes in Palestine and to those which dwelt at the foot of the Lebanon and on the Syrian coast, whom we call Phoenicians, while they called themselves כִנְזַן on their coins. The people of Carthage also called themselves so.

² Cf. inter alia: *su-ru-u* = יְרוּשָׁה, *abada* = אֲבָדָה, *ša'ari* or *ša'ri* = שַׁעַר, *baṭnu* = בָּטָן, *kilubi* = קִלְבִּי, *šadnuq* = שָׁדֵן (שָׁדִי) &c.

g Phoenician (Punic) words occurring in inscriptions are, e.g. אל God, אדם man, בן son, בת daughter, מלך king, עבד servant, כהן priest, זבח sacrifice, בעל lord, שמש sun, ארץ land, ים sea, אבן stone, כסף silver, ברזל iron, שמן oil, עת time, קבר grave, מצבת monument, מקם place, משכב bed, כל all, אחד one, שנים two, שלש three, ארבע four, חמש five, שש six, שבע seven, עשר ten, כן (= Hebr. היה) to be, שמע to hear, פתח to open, נדר to vow, ברך to bless, בקש to seek, &c. Proper names: צרן Sidon, צר Tyre, חנא Hanno, חנבעל Hannibal, &c. Comp. A. Bloch, *Phœnic. Glossar.*, Berl. 1890.

h Variations from Hebrew in Phoenician orthography and inflection are, e.g. the almost invariable omission of the vowel letters (§ 7. 2), as בית for house, קל for קול voice, צרן for צירון for כהנים priests, אלנם (in Plaut. *alonim*) gods; the fem., even in the absolute state, ending in ת (ath) (§ 80. 2) beside א (δ), the relative אש (Hebr. אִשָּׁה) &c. The differences in pronunciation are more remarkable, especially in Punic, where the i was regularly pronounced as u, e.g. שִׁפְטַת sūfēt (judge), שָׁלֹש salās (three), ראש rās = ראש head; i and e often as the obscure dull sound y, e.g. הַנְּנִי ynnynnu (ecce eum), ית (אית) yth; the v as o, e.g. מוער Mocar (comp. מֶעֶכָּה LXX, Gen. 22, 24 Μαῦρά). See the collection of the grammatical peculiarities in Gesenius, *Monumenta Phœnicia*, p. 430 sqq.; in Movers' article, 'Phönizien,' in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, Sect. iii, Bd. 24, p. 434 sqq.; Paul Schröder, *Die phöniz. Sprache*, Halle, 1869; B. Stade, 'Erneute Prüfung des zwischen dem Phöniz. und Hebr. bestehenden Verwandtschaftsgrades,' in the *Morgenländ. Forschungen*, Lpz. 1875.

i 4. As the Hebrew writing on monuments and coins mentioned in § 2. 2, consists only of consonants, so also the writers of the Old Testament books used merely the consonant-signs (§ 1. 5), and even now the written scrolls of the Law used in the synagogues must not, according to ancient custom, contain anything more. The present pronunciation of this consonantal text, its vocalization and accentuation, rest on the tradition of the Jewish schools, as it was finally fixed by the system of punctuation (§ 7 sqq.) introduced by Jewish scholars about the seventh century A.D.; comp. § 3. 2.

k An earlier stage of the development of the Canaanitish-Hebrew language, i.e. a form of it anterior to the written documents in our possession, and when it must have stood nearer to the original language of the united Semitic family, can still be discerned in its principal features:—(1) from many archaisms preserved in the traditional texts, especially in the names of persons and places dating from earlier times, as well as in isolated forms chiefly occurring in poetic style; (2) in general by an a posteriori conclusion from traditional forms, so far as according to the laws and analogies of phonetic change they obviously point back to an older phase of the language;

and (3) by comparison with the kindred languages, especially Arabic, in which this earlier stage of the language has been frequently preserved even down to later times (§ 1. 6). In numerous instances in examining linguistic phenomena the same—and consequently so much the more certain—result is attained by each of these three methods.

Although the systematic investigation of the linguistic development indicated above belongs to comparative Semitic philology, it is nevertheless indispensable for the scientific treatment of Hebrew to refer to the primitive Semitic ground-forms and to compare the corresponding forms in Arabic. Even elementary grammar which treats of the forms of the language occurring in the Old Testament frequently requires, for their explanation, a reference to these ground-forms.

5. Even in the language of the Old Testament, notwithstanding its general uniformity, there is noticeable an undoubted progress from an earlier to a later character. Two periods, though with some reservations, may be distinguished: the first, down to the end of the Babylonian exile; and the second, after the exile.

To the former belongs, apart from isolated traces of a later revision, the larger half of the Old Testament books, viz. (a) of the prose and historical writings, most of the Pentateuch and Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; (b) of the poetical, a part of the Psalms and Proverbs: (c) the writings of the earlier prophets in the following chronological order: Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Obadiah (?), Jeremiah, Ezekiel. The last two continued to flourish during the exile, to the close of which also some portions of Isaiah (especially chapters 40–66) belong.

The beginning of this period, and consequently of Hebrew literature generally, is undoubtedly to be placed as early as the time of Moses, although the Pentateuch in its present form, in which very different hands may be still clearly recognized, is to be regarded as a gradual production of the centuries after Moses. Certain linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch, which it was once customary to regard as archaisms, such as the epicene use of נָשִׁים *boy, youth*, for נָשִׁים *girl*, and נָשִׁים for נָשִׁים, are merely to be attributed to a later redactor; cf. § 17 ad fin. The linguistic character of the various strata of the Pentateuch has been examined by Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici sermone*, Lpz. 1878; König, *De criticae sacrae argumentis e linguae legibus repetitis*, Lpz. 1879 (Analysis of Gen. 1–11); F. Giesebrecht, 'Der Sprachgebr. des hexateuchischen Elohisten,' in *Ztschr. f. d. Alttest. Wissensch.* 1881, p. 177 sqq., partly modified by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xi. p. 201 sqq. Abundant matter is afforded also by Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Pentateuch*, Freib. 1893; Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 5th ed., Edinburgh, 1894; Strack, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, Munich, 1895; and with regard to the linguistic character of the Old Testament writings in general, König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, Bonn, 1893. On the linguistic

character of Deutero-Isaiah, comp. König, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des A. T.*, Lpz. 1882, i. 211 sq.; Cheyne, *Introd. to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 255 sqq.

o Moreover, there occur even in Jeremiah, and still more so in Ezekiel, decided approximations to the Aramaizing language of the second period (see § 2. 7); comp. Zimmer, *Aramaismi Jeremiani*, Halle, 1880, pt. i.

p 6. Even in the writings of this first period, which embraces nearly a thousand years, we meet, as might be expected, with some considerable differences in linguistic form and style, which are due partly to differences in the time and place of their composition, and partly to the individuality and power of the authors. Thus Isaiah, for example, writes quite differently from the later Jeremiah, but also differently from his contemporary Micah. Amongst the historical books of this period, the texts borrowed from earlier sources have a linguistic colouring perceptibly different from those derived from later sources, or passages which belong to the latest redactor himself. Yet the structure of the language, and, apart from isolated cases, even the vocabulary and phraseology, are on the whole the same, especially in the prose books.

q But the *poetic language* is in many ways distinguished from prose, not only by a *rhythm* consisting of more strictly balanced (parallel) members, but also by *peculiar words and meanings, inflexions and syntactical constructions* which it uses in addition to those usual in prose. This distinction, however, does not go far as, for example, in Greek. Many of these poetic peculiarities occur in the kindred languages, especially in Aramaic, as the ordinary modes of expression, and probably are to be regarded largely as archaisms which poetry retained. Some perhaps, also, are embellishments which the Hebrew poets who knew Aramaic adopted into their language¹.

The prophets, at least the earlier, in language and rhythm are to be regarded almost entirely as poets, except that with them the sentences are often more extended, and the parallelism is less regular and balanced than is the case with the poets properly so-called. The language of the later prophets, on the contrary, approaches nearer to prose.

¹ That already in Isaiah's time (second half of the eighth century B.C.) educated Hebrews, or at least officers of state, understood Aramaic, while the common people in Jerusalem did not, is evident from 2 Ki. 18, 26 (Is. 36, 11).

On the *rhythm* of Hebrew poetry, see besides the Commentaries on the *Psalms* by De Wette, Delitzsch, Hupfeld, and others, especially H. Ewald, 'Allgemeines über die hebr. Dichtung und über das Psalmenbuch,' in *Dichter des Alten Bundes*, Gött. 1839, 2nd ed., 1866, Th. i. 1 Hälfte; J. Ley, *Grundsätze des Rhythmus, &c.*, Halle, 1875; *Leitfaden der Metrik der hebr. Poesie*, Halle, 1887; Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften A. T.'s*, Braunsch. 1881, p. 141 sqq.

Of all views of this matter, the only sound one so far is Budde's discovery of the Qina- or Lamentation-Verse (*ZA W.* 1882, 6 sqq.; 1891, 234 sqq.; 1892, 31 sqq.), consisting of two members, the second at least one full word shorter than the other. The probability that a regular repetition of an equal number of syllables in *arsis* and *thesis* was observed by other poets, has been established by Duhm, Gunkel, and others, especially Zimmern, who adduces a Babylonian hymn in which the members are definitely marked (*Ztschr. für Assyriologie*, x. 1 sqq.). All the details, however, are as yet uncertain.

The ancient practice of writing certain poetical passages in verse-form (Ex. 15, 1-19. Deut. 32, 1-43. Jud. 5. 1 Sam. 2, 1-10. 2 Sam. 22, 23, 1-7. Ps. 18, 136. Prov. 31, 10-31. 1 Chron. 16, 8-36; cf. also Josh. 12, 9-24. Eccles. 3, 2-8. Est. 9, 7-10) has nothing to do with any question of metre.

Words are used in poetry, for which others are customary in prose, e.g. אָנֹשׁ *man* = אָדָם; אֶרֶץ *path* = דֶּרֶךְ; מִלָּה *word* = דְּבָר; חָזוּ *to see* = רָאָה; אָתָּה *to come* = בּוֹא.

To the poetic *significations of words* belongs the use of certain poetic epithets for the substantive; thus, for example, אֱלֹהִים *the strong one for God*; אֲרִי *the strong one for ox, horse*; לְבָנָה *alba for luna*.

Of word-forms, we may note, e.g. the longer forms of prepositions of place (§ 103. 3) עַל = עָלַי, עַל = עָלֶיךָ, עַל = עָלָיו; the endings י, ו, to the noun (§ 90); the pronominal suffixes מוֹ, מוֹ, מוֹ for מֶ, מֶ, מֶ (§ 58); the plural ending יִם for יָם (§ 87. 1, a). To the *syntax* belongs the far more sparing use of the article, of the relative pronoun, of the accusative particle אֵת; the construct state even before prepositions; the shortened imperfect with the same meaning as the ordinary form (§ 109. 2, b, Rem.), and in general a forcible brevity of expression.

7. The second period of the Hebrew language and literature, after the return from the exile until the Maccabees (about 160 B.C.), is chiefly distinguished by a constantly closer approximation of the language to the kindred western Aramaic dialect. This is due to the influence of the Aramaean, who lived in close contact with the recent and thinly-populated colony in Jerusalem, and whose dialect was already of importance as being the official language of the western half of the Persian empire. Nevertheless the supplanting of Hebrew by Aramaic proceeded only very gradually. Writings intended for popular use, such as the Hebrew original of Jesus the son of Sirach and the book of Daniel, not only show that Hebrew about 170 B.C. was still in use as a literary language, but also that it was still at least

understood by the people¹. When it had finally ceased to exist as a living language, it was still preserved as the *language of the Schools*—not to mention the numerous Hebraisms introduced into the Aramaic spoken by the Jews.

For particulars, see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, pp. 1-6. We may conveniently regard the relation of the languages which co-existed in this later period as similar to that of the High and Low German in North Germany, or to that of the High German and the common dialects in the south and in Switzerland. Even amongst the more educated, the common dialect prevails orally, whilst the High German serves essentially as the literary and cultured language, and is at least understood by all classes of the people. Wholly untenable is the notion, based on an erroneous interpretation of Neh. 8, 8, that the Jews immediately after the exile had completely forgotten the Hebrew language, and therefore needed a translation of the Holy Scriptures.

u The Old Testament writings belonging to this second period, in all of which the Aramaic colouring appears in various degrees, are: certain parts of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, Ruth, the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther; the prophetic books of Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Joel, Jonah, Daniel; of the poetical books, part of Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and a large part of the Psalms. As literary compositions, these books are sometimes far inferior to those of the first period, although there are parts which in purity of language and æsthetic value fall little short of the writings of the golden age; such, e.g. as the later Psalms, 120 sqq., 137, 139.

v *Later words* (Aramaisms) are, e.g. $\text{זמן} = \text{זמן}$ time; $\text{לָקַח} = \text{לָקַח}$ to take; $\text{סוף} = \text{סוף}$ end; $\text{לָשֶׁט} = \text{לָשֶׁט}$ to govern; $\text{חֲזָק} = \text{חֲזָק}$ to be strong.—Later meanings are, e.g. אָמַר (to say) to command; עָנָה (to answer) to begin a conversation.—*Orthographical and grammatical peculiarities* are, the frequent *scriptio plena* of י and י , e.g. יְיָ (elsewhere יְיָ), even שְׁמִי for שְׁמִי , רוֹב for רֹב ; the interchange of נֶפֶס and נֶפֶס final; the more frequent use of substantives in נֶפֶס , נֶפֶס , נֶפֶס , &c. (Comp. for the Psalms, especially, Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 461 sqq.)

But all the peculiarities of these later writers are not Aramaisms. Several do not occur in Aramaic and must have belonged at an earlier period to the Hebrew vernacular, especially it would seem in northern Palestine. There certain parts of Judges, amongst others, may have originated, as is indicated, e.g. by שֶׁ , the common form in Phœnician (as well as שֶׁ), for שֶׁ (§ 36), which afterwards recurs in Lamentations, the Song of Songs, the later Psalms, and Ecclesiastes.

¹ The very frequent employment of Hebrew in popular religious literature, which is partly preserved to us in the Midrašim, indicates, moreover, that Hebrew was widely understood much later than this.

² יְיָ in the Minor Prophets throughout (Hos. 3, 5, &c.) is due merely to a caprice of the Masoretes.

§ 3.] *Grammatical Treatment of the Language.* 17

Rem. 1. Regarding dialectical varieties in the old Hebrew language, only *one* express statement occurs in the Old Test., namely in Jud. 12, 6, according to which the Ephraimites in certain cases pronounced the ו as D. (Comp. Marquart in *ZAW.* 1888, p. 151 sqq.) Whether in Neh. 13, 24 by the *speech of Ashdod* a Hebrew, or a (wholly different) Philistine dialect, should be understood cannot be determined. On the other hand, many of the peculiarities in the above-mentioned North Palestine books (Judges and Hosea) are to be regarded as differences in dialect, and so also some exceptional forms in the Moabite inscription of Méša' (see above, § 2. 2).

2. It is evident, that in the extant remains of old Hebrew literature¹, the entire store of the ancient language is not preserved. The canonical literature of the Old Testament formed certainly only a fraction of the once extant national literature of the ancient Hebrews.

§ 3. *Grammatical Treatment of the Hebrew Language.*

Gesenius, *Gesch. der hebr. Sprache*, §§ 19-39; Oehler's article, 'Hebr. Sprache,' in Schmid's *Encykl. des ges. Erziehungs- u. Unterrichtswesens*, vol. iii. p. 346 sqq. (in the 2nd ed. revised by Nestle, p. 314 sqq.). Comp. also the literature cited above in the headings of §§ 1 and 2; also Böttcher, *Ausführl. Lehrb. der hebr. Spr.*, Lpz. 1866, i. p. 30 sqq.; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der Hebr. Spr. in Deutschl. vom Ende des 15. bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrh.*, Breslau, 1870; B. Pick, 'The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians,' in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1884, p. 450 sqq., and 1885, p. 470 sqq.

1. At the time when the old Hebrew language was gradually *a* becoming extinct and the formation of the Old Test. canon was approaching conclusion, the Jews began to explain and critically revise the sacred text, and sometimes to translate it into the vernacular languages which in various countries had come into use among them. The oldest translation is the Greek of the *seventy* (more correctly *seventy-two*) Interpreters (LXX), which was begun with the Pentateuch at Alexandria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, but not completed until a later date. It was drawn up by various authors, some of whom had a living knowledge of the original, and was intended for the use of Greek-speaking Jews, especially in Alexandria. Somewhat later the Aramaic translations, or Targums (תרגומים i.e. *interpretations*) were gradually formed from recensions made in Palestine and Babylonia. The *explanations*, derived in part from alleged tradition, refer almost exclusively to civil and ritual

¹ According to the calculation of the Dutch scholar ^xLeusden, the Old Test. contains 5,642 different Hebrew and Aramaic words. [Including proper names, 9,285.—G. W. C.]

law and dogmatic theology, and are no more scientific in character than much of the textual tradition of that period. Both kinds of traditions are preserved in the *Talmud*, the first part of which, the *Mišna*, was finally brought to its present form towards the end of the second century; of the remainder, the *Gemāra*, one part (the *Jerusalem or Palestinian Gem.*) about the middle of the fourth century, the other (the *Babylonian Gem.*) about the middle of the sixth century A.D.

The *Mišna* forms the beginning of the New-Hebrew literature; while the language of the *Gemaras* is for the most part Aramaic.

- b 2. To the interval between the completion of the *Talmud* and the earliest grammatical writers, belong mainly the vocalization and accentuation of the hitherto unpointed text of the Old Testament, according to the pronunciation traditional in the Synagogues and Schools (§ 7. 3), as well as the greater part of the collection of critical remarks which bears the name of *Masōra* (מסורה *traditio*?)¹. From this the text which has since been transmitted with rigid uniformity by the MSS., and is still the received text of the Old Testament, has obtained the name of the Masoretic Text.

- c E. F. K. Rosenmüller already (*Handbuch für d. Liter. der bibl. Kritik u. Exegese*, 1797, i. 247; *Vorrede zur Stereotyp-Ausg. des A. T.*, Lpz. 1834) maintained that our Old Test. text was derived from Codices belonging to a single recension. J. G. Sommer (cf. Cornill, *ZAW.* 1892, p. 309), Olshausen (since 1853), and especially De Lagarde (*Proverbiens*, 1863, p. 1 sqq.) have even made it probable that the original Masoretic text was derived from a single standard manuscript. Comp., however, E. König in *Ztschr. f. kirchl. Wiss.*, 1887, p. 279 sq. On the history of the Masora and the fixing of the Masoretic tradition, work has been done recently by Geiger, *Jüdische Ztschr.* iii. 78 sqq., and after him by Harris in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, i. 128 sqq., 243 sqq.; S. Frensdorff, by his edition of the *Ochla W'achla*, Hanover, 1864; and his *Massor. Wörterb.*, Hanover and Lpz. 1876, part i; and Ch. D. Ginsburg, *The Massora compiled from Manuscripts, &c.*, Lond. 1880 sqq., 3 vols.²; on the use of the Masora for the critical

¹ On the name Masora (or Massora, as Strack in the *Prot. Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed., ix. 388 sqq., who compares 'Kappōreth,' &c., E. König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 38 sqq.; *Lehrgeb. d. hebr. Sprache*, ii. 358 sqq.), and the great difficulty of satisfactorily explaining it, comp. De Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, i. 91 sqq.; W. Bacher's derivation of the expression (in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1891, p. 785 sqq.) from Ezek. 20, 37 (מסרה, i. e. מוסרה, being an equally legitimate form) is rightly rejected by König, l. c. The correctness of the form מסרה (by the side of the equally well-attested form מסרת) does not seem to us to be invalidated by his arguments.

² See Baer's criticism of this work in *ZDMG.* 1886, p. 743 sqq.

construction of the Text, especially by S. Baer, in his excellent editions of the several books (only Exod.-Deut. have still to appear), edited since 1869 conjointly with Fr. Delitzsch and G. Dahman, and recently by Baer alone. Comp. also § 7. 3. Rem.

The various readings of the Qrê (see § 17) form one of the oldest and most important parts of the Masora. The punctuation of the Text, however, is not to be confounded with the compiling of the Masora. The former was settled at an earlier period, and is the result of a much more exhaustive labour than the Masora, which was not completed till a considerably later time.

3. It was not until about the beginning of the tenth century *d* that the Jews, following the example of the Arabs, began their grammatical compilations. Of the numerous grammatical and lexicographical works of R. Sa'adya¹, beyond fragments in the Commentary on the Sepher Yešira (ed. Mayer-Lambert, pp. 42, 47, 75, &c.), only the explanation in Arabic of the seventy (more correctly ninety) *hapax legomena* in the Old Testament has been preserved. Written likewise in Arabic, but frequently translated into Hebrew, were the still extant works of the grammarians R. Yehuda Hayyûg (also called Abu Zakaria Yahya, about the year 1000) and R. Yona (Abû 'l-Walîd Merwân ibn Ganâh, about 1030). By the aid of these earlier labours, Abraham ben Ezra (commonly called Aben Ezra, ob. 1167) and R. David Qimhi (ob. 1235) especially gained a classical reputation by their Hebrew grammatical writings.

From these earliest grammarians are derived many principles of arrangement and technical terms, some of which are still retained, e.g. the naming of the conjugations and weak verbs according to the paradigm of *לפע*, certain *voces memoriales*, as *פָּתַח* and the like².

¹ On his independent attitude towards the Masoretic punctuation, see Delitzsch, *Comm. zu den Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 39.

² On the oldest Hebrew grammarians, see Strack and Siegfried, *Lehrb. d. neuhebr. Spr. u. Liter.*, Carlsr. 1884, p. 107 sqq., and the prefaces to the Hebrew Lexicons of Gesenius and Fürst; Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talmud u. Midrasch*, Berlin, 1879; Baer and Strack, *Die Dikduke ha-'amim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher u. andere alte grammatisch-masorethische Lehrstücke*, Lpz. 1879; Ewald and Dukes, *Beiträge z. Gesch. der ältesten Auslegung u. Spracherklärung des A. T.*, Stuttg. 1844, 3 vols.; Hupfeld, *De rei grammaticae apud Judaeos initiis antiquissimisque scriptoribus*, Hal. 1846, 4; W. Bacher, 'Die Anfänge der hebr. Gr.', in *ZDMG.* 1895, 1 sqq.; and *Die hebr. Sprachwissenschaft vom 10. bis zum 16. Jahrh.*, Trier, 1892. On Abu Zakaria, Jastrow in *ZAW.* 1885, p. 193 sqq., and B. Drachmann, Breslau, 1885. A fragment of his Arabic work on the weak verbs is given by Peritz in *ZAW.* 1893, p. 193 sqq. Munk, 'Notice sur Abou 'l-Walîd et sur quelques autres grammairiens hébreux du x^e et du xi^e

e 4. The father of Hebrew philology among Christians was John Reuchlin (ob. 1522), to whom Greek literature also is so much indebted. Like the grammarians who succeeded him, till the time of John Buxtorf the elder (ob. 1629), he still adhered almost entirely to Jewish tradition. From the middle of the seventeenth century the field of investigation gradually widened, and the study of the kindred languages, chiefly through the leaders of the Dutch school, Albert Schultens (ob. 1750) and N. W. Schröder (ob. 1798), became of fruitful service to Hebrew grammar.

f 5. In the nineteenth century¹ the advances in Hebrew philology are especially connected with the names of W. Gesenius (born at Nordhausen, Feb. 3, 1786; from the year 1810 Professor at Halle, where he died Oct. 23, 1842), who above all things aimed at the comprehensive observation and lucid presentation of the actually occurring linguistic phenomena; H. Ewald (ob. 1875, at Göttingen; *Krit. Gramm. der hebr. Spr.*, Lpz. 1827; *Ausführl. Lehrb. d. hebr. Spr.*, 8th ed., Gött. 1870), who chiefly endeavoured to refer linguistic formations to general laws and rationally to explain the latter; J. Olshausen (ob. 1882, at Berlin; *Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache*, Brunswick, 1861), who attempted a consistent explanation of the existing condition of the language, from the presupposed primitive Semitic forms, preserved according to him notably in old Arabic. F. Böttcher (see the bibliography at the head of § 3) endeavoured to present an exhaustive synopsis of the linguistic phenomena, as well as to give an explanation of them from the sphere of Hebrew alone. B. Stade, on the other hand (*Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, pt. i. Lpz. 1879), adopted the strictly scientific method of endeavouring to reduce the systems of Ewald and Olshausen to a more fundamental unity.

siècle,' in the *Journ. Asiatique*, 1850. The grammatical *Opuscles et traités* of Abu 'l-Walid have been edited by J. and H. Derenbourg, Paris, 1880; comp. also W. Bacher, 'Jos. Kimchi et Abulw. Mer.' &c. in vol. vi. of the *Revue des études juives*; and *Die hebr.-arab. Sprachvergleichung des Abulw. Mer.*, Vienna, 1884; *Leben und Werke des Abulw. Mer.*, &c., Lpz. 1885; also by the same author, *Abr. ibn Esra als Grammatiker*, Strassb. 1882; and *Die gramm. Terminologie des Jehuda ben David Hajjug*, Vienna, 1882.

¹ Of the literature of the subject down to the year 1850, see a tolerably full account in Steinschneider's *Bibliograph. Handbuch für hebr. Sprachkunde*, Lpz. 1859.

E. König¹ in his very thorough researches into phonology and etymology starts generally from the position reached by the early Jewish grammarians (in his second part 'with comparative reference to the Semitic languages in general') and instead of adopting the usual dogmatic method, takes pains to re-open the discussion of disputed grammatical questions.—Among the works of Jewish scholars, special attention is to be called to the grammar by S. D. Luzzatto written in Italian (Padua, 1853-69).

The chief requirements for one who is treating the grammar of an ancient language are—(1) that he should observe² as fully and accurately as possible the existing linguistic phenomena and describe them, after showing their organic connexion (the empirical and historico-critical element); (2) that he should try to explain these facts, partly by comparing them with one another and by the analogy of the sister languages, partly from the general laws of philology (the logical element).

§ 4. *Division and Arrangement of the Grammar.*

The division and arrangement of Hebrew grammar follow the three constituent parts of every language, viz. (1) articulate *sounds* represented by *letters*, and united to form *syllables*, (2) *words*, and (3) *sentences*.

The first part (the elements) comprises accordingly the treatment of *sounds* and their representation in writing. It describes the nature

¹ *Historisch-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Sprache mit steter Beziehung auf Qimchi und die anderen Autoritäten.* 1st part, 'Lehre von der Schrift, der Aussprache, dem Pron. u. dem Verbum,' Lpz. 1881; and part, vol. i. 'Abschluss der speciellen Formenlehre u. generelle Formenl.,' Lpz. 1895.

² Such observation has more and more led to the belief that the original text of the O. T. is corrupted to a greater degree than was formerly supposed. Advance in grammar is therefore closely dependent on the progress of *textual criticism*. The systematic pursuit of the latter has only begun in recent years. Cf. especially Doorninck on Jud. 1-16, Leyden, 1879; Wellhausen, *Text der Bb. Sam.*, Gött. 1871; Klostermann, *Bb. Sam. u. d. Kön.*, Nördl. 1887; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, Oxf. 1890; Cornill, *Ezechiel*, Lpz. 1886; Klostermann, *Sammlung hebr.-deutscher Bibeltexte mit krit. Anmerk.* (pt. i. Deutero-Isaiah), Munich, 1893. A critical edition of the O. T. with full textual notes, and with the various documents distinguished by colours, is being published in a handsome form by E. Haupt in *The Sacred Books of the O. T.* (Lpz. and Baltimore). Parts already published: *Job*, by Siegfried, 1893; *Leviticus*, by Driver and White, and *Samuel*, by Budde, 1894; *Joshua*, by Bennett; *Jeremiah*, by Cornill; *The Psalms*, by Wellhausen; *Chronicles*, by Kittel.

and relations of the sounds of a language, teaches the pronunciation of the written signs (orthoepy), and gives information concerning the established mode of writing (orthography). It then treats of the sounds as combined in syllables and words, and specifies the laws and conditions under which this combination takes place.

The second part (etymology) treats of words in their character as parts of speech, and comprises: (1) the principles of the *formation of words*, or of the derivation of the different parts of speech from the roots or from one another; (2) the principles of inflexion, i. e. of the various forms which the words assume according to their relation to other words and to the sentence.

The third part (syntax, the principles of the arrangement of words): (1) shows how the word-formations and inflexions which are met with in the language are used to express different shades of ideas, and how other ideas, for which the language has not coined any forms, are expressed by periphrasis; (2) states the laws according to which the parts of speech are combined in sentences (the principles of the sentence, or syntax in the strict sense of the term).

FIRST PART.

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OR THE SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS.

CHAPTER I.

THE INDIVIDUAL SOUNDS AND CHARACTERS.

§ 5. *The Consonants: their Form and Names.*

(Comp. the Table of Alphabets.)

1. The Hebrew letters now in use, in which both the manu- *a*
scripts of the Old Testament are written and our editions of the
Bible are printed, commonly called the *square character* (פְּתִיב סָרְבַּע),
also the *Assyrian character* (פְּתִיב אֲשִׁירִי)¹, are not those originally
employed.

Old Hebrew (or *Old Canaanitish*) writing, as it was used on public
monuments in the beginning of the ninth and towards the end of the
eighth century B. C., is to be seen in the inscription of *Mesa*, as well
as in that of *Siloam*. The characters on the *Maccabean* coins of the
second century B. C., and also on ancient gems, bear much resemblance
to those found in these inscriptions (comp. § 2. 2). With this Old
Hebrew writing the Phœnician is nearly identical (see § 1. 5, § 2. 3 and
the Table of Alphabets). According to the analogy of the history

¹ The name אֲשִׁירִי (Assyria) is here used in the widest sense, to include the
countries on the Mediterranean inhabited by Aramaeans; comp. Stade in *ZAW.*
1882, p. 292 sq. On some other names for Old Hebrew writing, comp. G. Hoff-
mann, *ibid.*, 1881, p. 334 sqq.; Buhl, *Kanon u. Text des A. T.*, Lpz. 1891,
p. 202.

of other kinds of writing, it may be assumed that out of and along with the writing on stone, a less antique and somewhat more conveniently rounded style was early developed, owing to the use of softer materials, skins, bark and the like. This the Samaritans retained after their separation from the Jews, while the Jews gradually (between the sixth and the fourth century) exchanged it for an Aramaic character. From this gradually arose (from about the fourth to the middle of the third century) what is called the *square character*, which consequently bears great resemblance to the extant forms of Aramaic writing; such as the Egyptian-Aramaean, the Nabatean and especially the Palmyrene. Of Hebrew inscriptions in the older square character, one belongs to the year 176 B. C.¹

- b 2. The Alphabet consists, like all Semitic alphabets, solely of consonants, 22 in number, some of which, however, have also a kind of vocalic power (§ 7. 2). The following Table shows their form, names, pronunciation and numerical value (Rem. 3):—

¹ De Vogüé, in *Revue archéol.*, nouvelle série, ix. 1864, p. 205 sq., and Table vii. No. 2; comp. Nöldeke, in *ZDMG.* xix. p. 640; for the development of Hebrew writing in general, Merx, art. 'Schreiben,' in Schenkel's *Bibellæxicon*, vol. v; Phil. Berger, art. 'Ecriture,' in Lichtenberger's *Encyclop. des sciences relig.*, Par. 1878, tom. iv. p. 227 sqq. (also published separately); H. Strack, 'Schreibkunst u. Schrift bei den Hebräern,' in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, 2nd ed., xlii. p. 689 sqq.; Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, Oxford, 1890, p. ix. sqq.; L. Blau, *Zur Einleitung in d. hl. Schrift*, Budapest, 1894, p. 49 sqq.; Benzinger, *Hebr. Archäologie*, Freib. 1894, p. 278 sqq.; Nowack, *Lehrb. der hebr. Archäologie*, i. 279 sqq. On the palaeography of the Hebrew square character, Harkavy, *Altjüd. Denkmäler aus der Krim*, Petersb. and Lpz. 1876, p. 108 sqq. The best Tables of Alphabets are those by J. Euting, in G. Bickell's *Outlines of Hebrew Grammar* (trans. into English by S. J. Curtiss, Lpz. 1877); the Hebrew Alphabet, in pt. vii. of the *Oriental Series of the Paleogr. Society*, London, 1882; and lastly (the most complete of all) in Chwolson's *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, Petersb. 1882.

FORM.	NAME.	PRONUNCIATION.	NUMERICAL VALUE.
א	' <i>Ālēph</i>	' <i>spiritus lenis</i>	1
ב	<i>Bēth</i>	<i>b</i> (<i>bh</i>)	2
ג	<i>Gimēl</i> (<i>Giml</i>)	<i>g</i> (<i>gh</i>)	3
ד	<i>Dālūth</i>	<i>d</i> (<i>dḥ</i>)	4
ה	<i>Hē</i>	<i>h</i>	5
ו	<i>Wāw</i>	<i>w</i> ¹	6
ז	<i>Zāyīn</i>	<i>z</i> , as in French (soft <i>s</i>)	7
ח	<i>Hēth</i>	<i>h</i> , a strong guttural	8
ט	<i>Tēth</i>	<i>t</i> , emphatic <i>t</i>	9
י	<i>Yōd</i>	<i>y</i> ¹	10
כ, final ך	<i>Kaph</i>	<i>k</i> (<i>kḥ</i>)	20
ל	<i>Lāmēd</i>	<i>l</i>	30
מ, final ם	<i>Mēm</i>	<i>m</i>	40
נ, final ן	<i>Nūn</i>	<i>n</i>	50
ס	<i>Sāmēkh</i>	<i>s</i>	60
ע	' <i>Āyīn</i>	' a peculiar guttural (see below)	70
פ, final ף	<i>Pē</i>	<i>p</i> (<i>pḥ</i>)	80
צ, final ץ	<i>Ṣādē</i>	<i>s</i> , emphatic <i>s</i>	90
ק	<i>Qōph</i>	<i>q</i> , a strong <i>k</i> ² formed at the back of the palate	100
ר	<i>Rēš</i>	<i>r</i>	200
שׁ	<i>Śīn</i>	<i>ś</i>	} 300
שׂ	<i>Šīn</i>	<i>š</i> , pronounced <i>sh</i>	
ת	<i>Tāw</i>	<i>t</i> (<i>tḥ</i>)	400

3. As the Table shows, five letters have a special form at the end of the word. They are called final letters, and were combined by the Jewish grammarians in the mnemonic word קמנפזש *Kamnāphās*, or better, with König, פזשקמ i.e. *as the breaker in pieces*.

¹ Philippi, 'Die Aussprache der semit. Consonanten י and י,' in *ZDMG.* 1886, p. 639 sqq., adduces reasons in detail for the opinion that 'the Semitic י and י are certainly by usage consonants, although by nature they are vowels, viz. *u* and *i*, and consequently are consonantal vowels;' comp. § 8. 5.

² As a representation of this sound the Latin *q* is very suitable, as it occupies in the alphabet the place of the Semitic ק (Greek *κόμμα*).

Of these ך, ך, ך, ך are distinguished from the common form by the shaft being drawn straight down, while in the usual form it is bent round towards the left¹. In the case of ם the letter is completely closed.

- d 4. Hebrew is read and written from right to left. Words must not be divided at the end of the lines; but, in order that no empty space may be left, in MSS. and printed texts, certain letters suitable for the purpose are dilated at the end or in the middle of the line. In our printed texts these *literae dilatabiles* are the five following: ם ת ל ה נ (mnemonic word מְהִלְתָּם). In MSS. other letters suitable for the purpose are also employed in this way, as ך, כ, ך; comp. Strack in the *Theol. Lehrb.* 1882, No. 22.

- e Rem. 1. The forms of the letters originally represent the rude outlines of perceptible objects, the names of which, respectively, begin with the consonant represented (akrophony). Thus *Yod*, in the earlier alphabets the rude picture of a hand, properly denotes *hand* (Heb. יָד), but as a letter simply the sound ' (י'), with which this word begins; *Ayin*, originally a circle, properly an *eye* (עַיִן), stands for the consonant ע. In the Phoenician alphabet, especially, the resemblance of the forms to the objects denoted by the name is still for the most part recognizable (see the Table). In some letters (א, א, א, א, ש) the similarity is still preserved in the square character.

- f The most probable meaning of the names of the letters of the alphabet² is: אֶלֶף *ox*, בַּיִת *house*, גִּמְלָא *camel*, דֶּלֶת *door*, הַחֹלֶה (*?*) *lattice-window* (*?*), וָן *hook, nail*, זֶרֶק *weapon* (unless, with Nestle, we are to infer from the Greek ζῆρα, that the original name was חֵטֶף *olive-tree*), חֵטֶף *fence, barrier*, טֹוֹב *a winding* (*?*), perhaps *leather bottle*, according to others *snake*, יָד *hand*, קָפֶה *bent hand*, לֶמֶד *ox-goad*, מַיִם *water*, נֶשֶׁן *fish*, פֶּסֶף *prop* (*?*), עַיִן *eye*, פֶּה (also פִּי) *mouth*, צֶדֶי *fish-hook* (*?*), קֵיף *eye of a needle*, according to others *back of the head*, רִישׁ *head*, שֵׁן *tooth*, טֶן *sign, cross*.

- g There is no doubt that this alphabet was first drawn up by Semites. It may be questioned, however, whether the Egyptian Hieroglyphics, and the Hieratic writing derived from it, did not serve as the model,—perhaps less as regards the forms than the (akrophonic) principle. For the hieroglyphic pictures likewise

¹ Chwolson, *Corpus Inscr. Hebr.* col. 68, rightly observes that the original forms of these letters are practically preserved in the *literae finales*.

² Cf. Conder, 'The Alphabet (the Semitic Names),' in the *Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1889, p. 17 sqq. The LXX give transcriptions of the Hebrew names in Lam. 1-4, as do also many Codices of the Vulgate (e.g. the Cod. Amiatinus) in Pss. 111. 112. 119, but with many variations from the customary forms, which rest on the traditional *Jewish* pronunciation. The forms *Deleth, Zai, Sen* (the LXX also χσεν, comp. Hebr. שֵׁן *tooth*) are to be noticed, amongst others, for *Daleth, Zain, Shin*.

indicate mostly the initial sound of the name of the pictured object; e.g. *lōl*, the hand, the letter *l*; *laboi*, the lion, the *l*¹.

2. As to the order of the letters, we possess an ancient testimony in the alphabetic poems of the Old Test.: Ps. 9 (N-3, comp. Ps. 10, 1 3, and vv. 12-17 P-N); 25 and 34 (both without a separate 1-verse and with D repeated at the end); 37. 111. 112. 119. 145; Lam. 1-4; Prov. 31, 10-31 (in the LXX with D before Y); also in Nah. 1, 2-10, Frohnmeyer detected traces of an alphabetic arrangement; so Bickell, *Ztschr. f. kath. Theol.*, 1882, p. 319 sqq., in the assumed Hebrew original of Jesus the son of Sirach, chap. 51, 18-38 (without 1 and with D repeated at the end). The sequence of the three softest labial, palatal, and lingual sounds 3, 3, 7, and of the three liquids 3, 3, 3, indicates an attempt at classification. At the same time other considerations also appear to have had influence. Thus it is certainly not accidental, that two letters, representing a hand (*Ydd*, *Kaph*), as also two (if *Qōph* = back of the head) which represent the head, and in general several forms denoting objects naturally connected (*Mēm* and *Nūn*, *ʿAyn* and *Pē*), stand next to one another.

Both the order and the names of the letters, together with their numerical values, have passed over from the Phoenicians to the Greeks, in whose alphabet the letters A-T are borrowed from the Old Semitic. So also the Old Italic alphabets as well as the Roman, and consequently all alphabets derived either from this or from the Greek, are directly or indirectly dependent on the Phoenician.

3. a. In default of special arithmetical figures, the consonants were used also as numerical signs. The earliest traces of this usage are, however, first found on the Maccabean coins (see above, § 2. 2, 4). These numerical letters were afterwards employed principally for marking the numbers of chapters and verses in the editions of the Bible. The units are denoted by N-D, the tens by 1-Y, 100-400 by P-N, the numbers from 500-900 by 7 (= 400), with the addition of the remaining hundreds, e.g. 377 500. In compound numbers the greater precedes (on the right), thus 11, 377 121. But 15 is expressed by 37 9 + 6, not 77 (which is a form of the divine name, being the first two consonants of 777)². For

¹ Comp. above, § 1. 5, 1; also Hitzig, *Die Erfindung des Alphabets*, Zürich, 1840; J. Olshausen, *Über den Urspr. des Alphabets*, Kiel, 1841; F. Böttcher, *Unseres Alphabetes Ursprünge*, Dresd. 1860; Ed. Böhmer, 'Das Alphabet in organischer Ordnung,' in *ZDMG.* xvi. 579 sqq.; E. de Rougé, *Mémoire sur l'origine égyptienne de l'alphabet phénicien*, Paris, 1874; E. van Drival, *De l'origine de l'écriture*, 3rd ed., Paris, 1879. The attempt of Wuttke, in the 2nd ed. of his *Gesch. der Schrift*, and W. Deecke, *ZDMG.* xxxi. 102 sqq., to derive the Old Semitic alphabet from the later Assyrian cuneiform characters, fails even on chronological grounds. According to Peters, *Proceedings Am. Orient. Soc.*, 1880, p. xi sq., and Hommel, 'Gesch. Babylonien u. Assyrien,' p. 50 sqq., in Oncken's Series, 1885, it is derived from the old Babylonian writing. According to Ball, *Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archaeol.*, xv. 392 sqq., from the archaic Assyrian cuneiform.

² Compare for the rise of this custom (after 77 had been originally written, and afterwards 77), Nestle in *ZAW.* 1884, p. 250, where a trace of this method of writing occurring as early as Origen is referred to.

a similar reason יו is also mostly written for יו, instead of יו, which in compound proper names, like יואל, also represents the name of God, יהוה.

The thousands are sometimes denoted by the units with two dots placed above, e.g. ק̇ק̇ 1000.

- l b. The reckoning of the years in Jewish writings (generally לתיצירה *after the creation*) follows either the *full chronology* (לפרט ג' or ל'ג), with the addition of the thousands, or the *abridged chronology* (ל'ג קטון), in which they are omitted. In the dates of the first thousand years after Christ, the Christian era is obtained by the addition of 240, in the second thousand years by the addition of 1240, the thousands of the Creation era being omitted.
- 111 4. Abbreviations of words are not found in the text of the Old Testament, but they occur on coins, and their use is extremely frequent amongst the later Jews¹. A point, or later an oblique stroke, serves as the sign of abridgement in old MSS. and editions, e.g. יש for ישראֵל, פ' for פלני *aliquis*, ר' for דבר *aliquid*, ונ' for ונאמר *et complens*, i.e. *and so on*. Also in the middle of what is apparently a word, such strokes indicate that it is an abbreviation or a *vox memorialis* (comp. e.g. § 15. 3 טמ'ם). Two such strokes are employed, from § 41, c Rem., onward, to mark the different classes of weak verbs; comp. moreover יי or י (also 'ה) for יהוה.
- 112 5. Peculiarities in the tradition of the Old Testament text, which are already mentioned in the Talmud, are—(1) The *puncta extraordinaria* over single consonants (e.g. Gen. 16, 5. 19, 33), or whole words (e.g. Gen. 33, 4. Deut. 29, 28. Is. 44, 9. Ezek. 41, 20 and elsewhere), and both over and under Ps. 27, 13, all no doubt originally critical marks; cf. Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 88 sqq.; L. Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, Strassburg, 1891, p. 6 sqq., and *Einleitung in die hl. Schrift*, Budapest, 1894; Königsberger, *Jüd. Lit.-Blatt*, 1891, nos. 29–31, and *Aus Masorah u. Talmudkritik*, Berlin, 1892, p. 6 sqq. (2) The *litterae majusculae* (e.g. ג Gen. 1, 1, ו Lev. 11, 42 as the middle consonant of the Pentateuch, י Num. 14, 17, &c.), and *minusculae* (e.g. ה Gen. 2, 4). (3) The *litterae suspensae* נ Jud. 18, 30 (which points to the reading מִן־נֶשֶׁה for מִן־נֶשֶׁה), ע Ps. 80, 14 (the middle of the Psalms)² and Job 38, 13. 15. (4) The 'mutilated' Wāw שלום Num. 25, 12, and ק Ex. 32, 25 (בַּקְמִיהֶם), and Num. 7, 2 (הַפְּקוּדִים). (5) *Mēm clausum* in לַמִּרְבָּה Is. 9, 6, and *Mēm apertum* in הִם פְּרוּצִים Neh. 2, 13. (6) *Nūn inversum* before Num. 10, 35, and after ver. 36, as also before Ps. 107, 23–28 and 40.

§ 6. Pronunciation and Division of Consonants.

P. Haupt, 'Die Semit. Sprachlaute u. ihre Umschrift,' in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. vergleich. semit. Sprachwissenschaft*, by Delitzsch and Haupt, Lpz. 1889, i. 249 sqq.

- a 1. An accurate knowledge of the original phonetic value of each consonant is of the greatest importance, since very many grammatical peculiarities and changes (§ 18 sqq.) only become intelligible from the nature and pronunciation of the sounds. This

¹ Cf. Jo. Buxtorf, *De abbreviaturis Hebr.*, Basel, 1613, &c.; Ph. Lederer, *Hebr. u. Chald. Abbreviaturen*, Frankfurt, 1893.

² See *Qiddūšīn*, chap. i. fol. 39.—G. W. C.]

knowledge is obtained partly from the pronunciation of the kindred dialects, especially the still living Arabic, partly by observing the affinity and interchange of sounds in Hebrew itself (§ 19), and partly from the tradition of the Jews¹.

The pronunciation of Hebrew by the modern Polish and German Jews, which partly resembles the Syriac, differs considerably from that of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, which approaches nearer to the Arabic. The pronunciation of Hebrew by Christians, follows the latter (after the example of Reuchlin), in almost all cases.

The oldest tradition is presented in the transcription of Hebrew names in Assyrian cuneiform; a later, but yet in its way very important system is seen in the manner in which the LXX transcribe Hebrew names with Greek letters². As however corresponding signs for several sounds (ח, ו, ש, פ, ע) are wanting in the Greek alphabet, only an approximate representation was possible in these cases. The same applies to the Latin transcription of Hebrew words by Jerome, according to the Jewish pronunciation of his time³.

On the pronunciation of the modern Jews in North Africa, see Bargès in the *Journ. Asiat.*, Nov. 1848; on that of the South Arabian Jews, J. Derenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, &c. (from a Yemen MS. of the year 1390), Paris, 1871, Extrait 6 du *Journ. Asiat.* 1870.

2. With regard to the pronunciation of the several gutturals and sibilants, and of ח and פ, it may be remarked :—

1. Among the gutturals, א is the lightest, corresponding to the *spiritus lenis* of the Greeks, the use of which results from the correct observance of the fact, that a soft aspiration precedes every initial vowel in virtue of its nature. It may stand

¹ Comp. C. Meinhof, 'Die Aussprache des Hebr.' in *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.*, 1885, Bd. 132, p. 146 sqq.; M. Schreiner, 'Zur Gesch. der Ausspr. des Hebr.' in *ZA W.* 1886, p. 213 sqq. More exact physiological observations of the whole phonetic system and its formation by the organs of speech, are also important for this purpose; comp. E. Brücke, *Grundzüge der Physiologie u. Systematik der Sprachlaute*, Vienna, 1856, 2nd ed. 1876; C. L. Merkel, *Physiologie der menschl. Sprache*, Lpz. 1866; F. Delitzsch, *Physiologie u. Musik in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gramm., bes. die Hebräische*, Lpz. 1868; E. Sievers, *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie*, Lpz. 1876 (2nd-4th ed. entitled *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, 1881, 1885, 1893); H. Sweet, *Handbook of Phonetics*, Oxford, 1877, 2nd ed. 1889, and *A Primer of Phonetics*, Oxford, 1890; F. Techmer, *Phonetik*, Lpz. 1880, pt. i; Trautmann, *Die Sprachlaute*, &c., Lpz. 1884-86, 2 pts.; P. Tassy, *Études sur les changements phonétiques et leurs caractères généraux*, Paris, 1891; Bremer, *Deutsche Phonetik*, Lpz. 1893.

² Comp. on this, Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuag.*, Lpz. 1841, p. 90 sqq.; C. Könneke, 'Gymn.-Progr.', Stargard, 1885.

³ Numerous examples occur in *Hieronymi quaestiones hebraicae in libro geneseos*, edited by P. de Lagarde, Lpz. 1868; comp. the exhaustive and systematic discussion by Siegfried, 'Die Aussprache des Hebr. bei Hieronymus,' in *ZA W.* 1884, pp. 34-83.

either at the beginning or end of a syllable, e.g. אָמַר 'āmār, יָאֵד yā'īd. Even before a vowel \aleph is almost lost to our ear, like the *h* in *hour* and in the French *habit, homme*. After a vowel \aleph generally (and at the end of a word, always) coalesces with it, e.g. קָרָא qārā for an original qārā', Arab. qārā'd; see further, § 23. 1, 27. 2 c.

d \aleph before a vowel, corresponds exactly to our *h* (*spiritus asper*); after a vowel it is *either* a guttural (so always at the end of a syllable which is not final, e.g. נָחַק nāḥqā; at the end of a word the consonantal \aleph has a point—Mappiq—in it, according to § 14), *or* it stands inaudible at the end of a word, generally as a mere orthographical indication of a preceding vowel, e.g. גָּלָא gālā; cf. § 7. 2 and 75. 1.

e \aleph is related to \aleph , but is a much stronger guttural. Its strongest sound is a rattled *g* formed at the back of the palate, comp. e.g. חָגַל LXX Γάλα, חָגַל Γάλοπα; elsewhere, a weaker sound of the same kind, which the LXX reproduce by a *spiritus (lenis or asper)*, e.g. עָל 'חל, עָל 'Amalek. In the mouth of the Arabs one hears in the former case a sort of guttural *r*, in the latter a sound peculiar to themselves formed in the back of the throat. It is as incorrect to omit the \aleph entirely, in reading and transcribing words (עָל *Eli*, עָל *Amalek*), as to pronounce it exactly like *g* or like a nasal *ng*. The stronger sound might be approximately transcribed by *gh* or '*g*'; but since in Hebrew the softer sound was the more common, it is sufficient to represent it by the sign '*a*', as עָדָא 'arba', עָד 'ad.

f \aleph is the strongest guttural sound, like the deep guttural *ch*, as sounded generally in Swiss German, somewhat as in the German *Achat, Macht, Sache, Docht, Zucht* (not as in *Licht, Knecht*), similar to the Spanish *j*. Like \aleph it was however pronounced in many words feebly, in others strongly.

g As regards \aleph , its pronunciation as a palatal (with a vibrating uvula) seems to have been the prevailing one. Hence it is not merely classed with the Liquids (*l, m, n*), but in some respects also with the gutturals (§ 22. 5). On the *lingual* \aleph , comp. § 6. 4.

h 2. The Hebrew language is unusually rich in sibilants. These have, at any rate in some cases, arisen from linguals which are retained as such in Aramaic and Arabic (see in the *Lexicon* the letters ש , ז and צ).

i ש and ז were originally represented (as is still the case in the unpointed texts) by only *one* form ש ; but that the use of this one form to express two different sounds (at least in Hebrew) was due only to the poverty of the alphabet, is clear from the fact that they are differentiated in Arabic and Ethiopic (comp. Nöldeke in *Ztschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1873, p. 121). In the Masoretic punctuation they were distinguished by means of the diacritical point as ש (*sh*) and ז (*z*)¹.

k The original difference between the sounds ז and צ sometimes occasions

¹ The modern Samaritans, however, in reading their Hebrew Pentateuch pronounce ז invariably as ש .

² The original value of צ , and its relation to the original value of ז and ש , is still undetermined, despite the valuable investigations of D. H. Müller, 'Zur

§ 6.] *Pronunciation and Division of Consonants.* 31

a distinction in meaning, e.g. סָכַר *to close*, שָׁכַר *to hire*, סָכַל *to be foolish*, שָׁכַל *to be prudent, to be wise*. The Syrians always represent both sounds by ס, and in Hebrew also they are sometimes interchanged; as סָכַר for שָׁכַר *to hire*, Exr. 4, 5; שָׁכַל for סָכַל *folly*, Eccles. 1, 17.

י (transcribed ζ by the LXX) is a soft whizzing *s*, the French and English *s*, altogether different from the German *s*.

3. ס, פ, and צ are pronounced with a strong articulation and with a compression of the larynx. The first two are thus essentially different from ת and כ, which correspond to our *t* and *k* and are often aspirated (see below, no. 3). צ is distinguished from every other *s* by its peculiar articulation, and in no way corresponds to the German *s* or *ts*; we transcribe it by *f*.

3. Six consonants, the weak and middle hard *mutae*

ב נ ד כ פ ת (בְּנִדְכָּפֶת)

have a twofold pronunciation, (1) a harder sound as *tenuis* like *k*, *p*, *t*, or as *mediae* like *b*, *g* hard, *d*; and (2) a softer sound as *spirantes*¹. The harder sound is the original. It is retained at the beginning of syllables, when there is no vowel immediately preceding to influence the pronunciation, and is denoted by a point *Dages lene* (§ 13), placed in the consonants, viz. בּ *b*, גּ *g*, דּ *d*, כּ *k*, פּ *p*, תּ *t*. The weaker pronunciation appears as soon as a vowel sound immediately precedes. It is occasionally denoted, esp. in MSS., by *Rāphè* (§ 14. 2), but in printed texts usually by the mere absence of the *Dages*. In the case of ב, ג, and ד, the distinction is less noticeable to our ear. Yet the German dialects mostly distinguish, e.g. in *beben*, the second *b*, influenced by the preceding ^a vowel, from the first, and in the same way the two *g*-sounds in *gegen*. In the case of כ, פ, ת, the two sounds are clearly distinguishable even to our ear as *k* and German (weak) *ch*, *p* and *ph*, *t* and English *th*. The Greeks too express this twofold pronunciation by special characters: ב κ, כ χ; פ π, פ φ; ת τ, ת θ.

Geschichte der semit. Zischlaute,' in the *Verhandlungen des Wiener Orient. Congresses*, Vienna, 1888, Semitic section, p. 229 sqq.; De Lagarde, 'Samech,' in the *Nachrichten der Gött. Gesellschaft d. Wiss.*, 1891, no. 5, esp. p. 173; Aug. Müller, *ZAW.* 1891, p. 267 sqq.; Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 1893, p. 100 sq.

¹ So at any rate at the time when the present punctuation arose, replacing an earlier pronunciation as *aspiratae*. However, it cannot be determined whether the transition from *aspiratae* to *spirantes* took place in *all* these sounds and in *every* case.

² And also by the following vowel; for at the end of a word the *b* after a vowel is pronounced as a *tenuis*, comp. *gieb*, *bleib*, and on the other hand *Sieg*, *schweig*.

32 *The Individual Sounds and Characters.* [§ 6.

For more precise information on the cases in which the one or the other pronunciation takes place, see § 21. The modern Jews pronounce the aspirated כ as *v*, the aspirated ת as *s*, e.g. רַב *rav*, בַּיִת *bais*.

- 0 4. According to the organ of speech with which the consonants are pronounced, they are divided into—

(a) Gutturals	א ע ה ח	(אֵיִחֵחַ);
(b) Palatals	ק נ כ י	(קֵיכֵי);
(c) Linguals	ט ת ד with נ and ל	(טֵתֵלֵנֵד);
(d) Dentals or Sibilants	צ ש (שׁ and שׂ) ז ס	(צֵשֵׁזֵס);
(e) Labials	פ ב מ ו	(פֵּבֵמֵו);

In the case of ר its hardest pronunciation as a *palatal* (see above, letter *g* at the end) is to be distinguished from its more unusual sound as a lingual, in the front of the mouth.

Comp. on the twofold pronunciation of *r* in Tiberias, Delitzsch, *Physiol. und Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 10 sqq.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, Lpz. 1879, p. 5, note *a*, and § 7 of the Hebrew text, as well as p. 82.

Independently of the organs of speech the liquids (ל, מ, נ, ר) are also grouped together as a distinct class.

- p The Hebrew phonetic system may be more precisely represented in the following table:—

	MUTAE. w. m. e.	LIQUIDAE. vibr. nasal semivow.	SIBILANTES. w. m. e.	EXPLOSIVE SPIRANTES.
Guttural		ר		א ע ה ח
Palatal	נ כ ק	י		
Lingual		[ר] ל		
Dental	ד ת ט	נ	ז ש שׂ שׁ	
Labial	ב פ מ	ו		

- q Rem. 1. The meaning of the letters in the heading is, w. = weak, m. = middle hard, e. = emphatic. Consonants which are produced by the same organ of speech are called *homorganic* (e.g. נ and כ as palatals), consonants whose sound is of the same nature *homogeneous* (e.g. מ and ל as liquids). On their homorganic character and homogeneity depends the possibility of a change of sound, as well within Hebrew itself as between the kindred dialects. In such cases the soft sound generally interchanges with the soft, the hard with the hard, &c. (e.g. ר = ל, ת = שׂ, מ = צ). Further transitions are not however excluded, as e.g. the interchange of ת and פ (ת = כ = פ). Here it is of importance to observe whether the change takes place in an initial, middle, or final letter; since e.g. the change in a letter when

medial does not always prove the possibility of its change when initial. That in certain cases the character of the consonantal sound also influences the preceding or following vowel will be noticed in the accidence as the instances occur.

Rem. 2. Very probably as the pronunciation was handed down, in course of time certain nicer distinctions became more and more neglected and finally were lost. Thus e.g. the stronger ʔ 'g, which was known to the LXX (see above letter e), became in many cases altogether lost to the later Jews; by the Samaritans and Galileans ʔ , as well as ן , was pronounced only like כ (as in Ethiopic ʔ like כ , ן like ח , ש like ש).

Rem. 3. The consonants which it is usual to designate especially as *weak*, are those which readily coalesce with a preceding vowel to form a long vowel, viz. כ , ל , י ; as to ן , comp. § 23. 4; or those which are most frequently affected by the changes described in § 19. 2, 3, as again כ , ל , י , and ז , and in certain cases ה and ב ; finally ר for the reason assigned in § 22. 5 a.

§ 7. The Vowels in General, Vowel Letters and Vowel Signs.

1. The original vowels in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic α tongues, are a , i , u . E and o always arise from an obscuring or contraction of these three pure sounds, viz. ē by a modification from ī or ā ; short ē from ū ; ē from a contraction of ai (properly ay); and ō sometimes from a modification (obscuring) of ā , sometimes from a contraction of au (properly aw).

In Arabic writing there are vowel signs only for a , i , u ; the combined sounds ay and aw are therefore retained uncontracted and pronounced as diphthongs (ai and au), e.g. سأف Arab. *saut*, and أينان Arab. *'ainain*. It was only in later Arabic that they became in pronunciation ē and ō , at least after weaker or softer consonants; comp. بائن Arab. *bain*, *bēn*, يأوم Arab. *yaum*, *yōm*. The same contraction appears also in other languages, e.g. in Greek and Latin (*Kaïōap*, *Caesar*; *θαῦμα*, Ionic *θῶμα*; *plaustrum* = *plostrum*), in the French pronunciation of ai and au , and likewise in the German popular dialects (*Oge* for *Auge*, *Steen* for *Stein*, &c.). Similarly, the obscuring of the vowels plays a part in various languages (cf. e.g. the α in modern Persian, Swedish, English, &c.)¹.

2. The partial expression of the vowels by certain consonants ב (ה , ל , י ; כ), which sufficed during the lifetime of the language, and for a still longer period afterwards (comp. § 1. 5), must in the main have passed through the following stages²:—

(a) The need of a written indication of the vowel to be read first made itself felt in cases where, after the rejection of a consonant,

¹ In Sanskrit, in the Old Persian cuneiform, and in Ethiopic, short α alone of all the vowels is not represented, but the consonant by itself is pronounced with short α .

² Comp. especially, Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, p. 34 sqq.

or of an entire syllable, a long vowel formed the final sound of the word. The first step in such a case was to retain the original final consonant, at least as a vowel letter, i.e. merely as an indication of a final vowel. In point of fact we find even in the Old Testament, as already on the Mēša' stone, a ה employed in this way (see below)—as an indication of a final *o*. From this it was only a step to the employment of the same consonant to indicate also other vowels when final (thus, e.g. in the inflection of the verbs לָהֶן, the vowels \bar{a} ¹, \bar{e} , \bar{e}). After the employment of ו as a vowel letter for \bar{o} and \bar{u} , and of י for \bar{e} and \bar{i} , had been established (see below, letter \bar{e}), these consonants were also employed—although not consistently—for the same vowels at the end of a word.

- c According to § 91. 1 and Rem. 1. \bar{o} , the suffix of the 3rd sing. masc. in the noun (as in the verb) was originally pronounced הו. But in the places where this הו with a preceding *a* is contracted into \bar{o} (after the rejection of the ה), we find the ה still frequently retained as a vowel letter, e.g. עִירָה, סִירָה Gen. 49, 11, comp. § 91. 1, Rem. 2; so throughout, on the Mēša' stone אִירָה, בִּירָה (also בִּירָה), בִּירָה, בִּירָה, בִּירָה, בִּירָה, בִּירָה; on the other hand already in the Siloam inscription רָעוּ מֶשָׁא, l. 8 = יָמָיו *his days* is unusual, as also רָשָׁה l. 20 if it = יָרָשָׁה *his chiefs*. The verbal forms with ה suffixed are to be read יָרָשָׁה (l. 6), וְאִסְתַּבַּח (l. 12 sq.) and וַיִּנְרָשָׁה (l. 19).

- d As an example of the original consonant being retained, we might also include the י of the constr. state plur. masc. if its \bar{e} (according to § 89. 2 c, Rem.) has arisen from an original *ay*. Against this assumption it may however be urged that the Phoenician inscriptions do not usually express this \bar{e} , nor any other final vowel².

¹ According to Stade, l. c. p. 35, the employment of ה for \bar{a} perhaps first took place in the case of the locative accusatives which originally ended in הָ, as בְּרִימָה, אִרְצָה.

² Thus there occurs, e.g. in Melit. 1, l. 3 שְׁנֵי בְנֵי שַׁבְנָן *the two sons*; elsewhere כּ for בֵּי (the inscriptions of Mēša' and Siloam exhibit the latter), ו for וְהָ (the latter in the Siloam inscription), בְּנָת = בְּנָתִי (so Mēša') or בְּנִיתִי, &c. Comp. on the other hand in Mēša', אֲנִי = אֲנִי (unless it was actually pronounced 'andkh by the Moabites!). As final \bar{a} is represented by ה and א and final \bar{e} by י, so final \bar{o} is almost everywhere expressed by ו in Mēša', and always in the Siloam inscription. It is indeed not impossible that Hebrew orthography also once passed through a period in which the final vowels were left always or sometimes undenoted, and that not a few strange forms in the present text of the Bible are to be explained from the fact that subsequently the vowel letters (especially ו and י) were not added in all cases. So Chwolson, in 'Die Quiescentia הוּ in der althebr. Orthogr.', in *Travaux du Congrès international des Orientalistes*, Petersb. 1876, with many

(b) The employment of \imath to denote δ , \mathfrak{d} , and of \imath to denote ℓ , f , e may have resulted from those cases in which a \imath with a preceding a was contracted into au and further to δ , or with a preceding \mathfrak{a} coalesced into \mathfrak{d} , and where \imath with a has been contracted into ai and further to ℓ , or with a preceding i into f (comp. § 24). In this case also the previously existing consonants were retained as vowel letters and were further applied at the end of the word to denote the respective long vowels. Finally \mathfrak{a} also will in the first instance have established itself as a vowel letter only where a consonantal \mathfrak{a} with a preceding a had coalesced into \mathfrak{d} .

The orthography of the Siloam inscription corresponds almost exactly with the above assumptions. Here (as on the Mēša' stone) we find all the long vowels, which have not arisen from original diphthongs, *without* vowel letters, thus \mathfrak{a} ש, \mathfrak{d} חצבם, \mathfrak{d} מִיָּמָן (or \mathfrak{d} מִיָּמָן); \mathfrak{a} פֹּת, \mathfrak{d} ל, \mathfrak{d} שֶׁלֶשׁ, \mathfrak{d} צֶר. On the other hand \mathfrak{a} מִוֶּצֵא (from *mausa'*), \mathfrak{d} עוֹד (from *'aud*); \mathfrak{d} מִיָּמָן also, if it is to be read \mathfrak{d} מִיָּמָן, is an instance of the retention of a \imath which has coalesced with i into f . Instances of the retention of an originally consonantal \mathfrak{a} as a vowel letter are \mathfrak{a} מִתְחִים, \mathfrak{a} מִוֶּצֵא, and \mathfrak{a} קָרָא, as also \mathfrak{a} שֶׁשׁ. Otherwise final \mathfrak{a} is always represented by ה: \mathfrak{a} פֹּתָה, \mathfrak{d} הָיָה, \mathfrak{d} וָהָה, \mathfrak{d} נָקָה. To this \mathfrak{d} alone would form an exception (comp. however the note on \mathfrak{d} יום, § 96), instead of \mathfrak{d} יום (Arab. *yaum*) *day*, which one would expect. If the reading be correct, this is to be regarded as an argument that a consciousness of the origin of many long vowels was lost at an early period, so that (at least in the middle of the word) the vowel letters were omitted in places where they should stand, according to what has been stated above, and added where there was no case of contraction. This view is in a great measure confirmed by the orthography of the Mēša' inscription. There we find, as might be expected, \mathfrak{d} ריבן (= *Daibōn*, as the *Δαιβών* of the LXX proves), \mathfrak{d} חֹרֶבֶן (δ from au), and \mathfrak{d} בִּיתָה (ℓ from ai), but also even \mathfrak{d} הַשְּׁעָנִי instead of \mathfrak{d} הַשְּׁעָנִי (from *haus-*), \mathfrak{d} וְהַשְּׁבִי = \mathfrak{d} וְהַשְּׁבִי, \mathfrak{d} בַּת four times, \mathfrak{d} בַּתָּה once, for \mathfrak{d} בַּית and \mathfrak{d} בַּיתָה (from *baît*); \mathfrak{d} לֵלָה = \mathfrak{d} לֵלָה, \mathfrak{d} אֵין = \mathfrak{d} אֵין or \mathfrak{d} אֵין.

(c) In the present state of Old Testament orthography as it appears in the Masoretic text, the striving after a certain uniformity cannot be mistaken, in spite of the inconsistencies which have crept in. Thus the final long vowel is, with very few exceptions (comp. § 9. 1 at the end, and the very doubtful cases in § 8. 4), indicated by a vowel letter—and almost always by the same letter

proofs. It cannot be proved (as L. Bardowicz, *Studien sur Geschichte der Orthographie im Althebräischen*, Frankfurt, 1894, seeks to show) that in Bible MSS. of the time of the Talmud and Midrash, the letters יוֹמָא were not so frequently used as in the Masoretic text.

¹ \mathfrak{d} הַשְּׁעָנִי is the more strange since the name of king \mathfrak{d} הַשְּׁעָנִי is represented as *A-u-si'* in cuneiform as late as 728!

in certain nominal and verbal endings. In many cases the use of י to mark an *o* or *u*, arising from contraction, and of י for *e* or *i*, is by far the more common, while we seldom find an originally consonantal א rejected, and the simple phonetic principle taking the place of the historical orthography. On the other hand the number of exceptions is very great. In many cases (as e.g. in the plural endings וֹ— and וִי) the vowel letters are habitually employed to express long vowels which do not arise through contraction, and we even find short vowels indicated. The conclusion is, that if there ever was a period of Hebrew writing when the application of fixed laws to all cases was considered, either these laws were not consistently carried out in the further transmission of the text, or errors and confusion afterwards crept into it. Moreover much remained uncertain even in texts which were plentifully provided with vowel letters. For, although in most cases the context was a guide to the correct reading, yet there were also cases where, of the many possible ways of pronouncing a word, more than one appeared admissible¹.

- h* 3. When the language had died out, and the ambiguity of such a writing must have been found continually more troublesome, and there was a danger that the correct pronunciation might be finally lost, the vowel signs or vowel points were invented in order to fix it. By means of these points everything hitherto left uncertain was most accurately settled. It is true that there is no historical account of the date of this vocalization of the Old Testament text, yet we may at least infer, from a comparison of other historical facts, that it was gradually developed by Jewish grammarians under the influence of different Schools in the sixth and seventh centuries A. D., traces of which have been preserved to the present time in various differences of reading². They mainly followed, though with independent regard

¹ Thus e.g. לִפְתָּל can be read *qāṭal*, *qāṭāl*, *qāṭōl*, *qāṭēl*, *qāṭīl*, *qāṭīl*, *qūṭal*, *qūṭēl*, and several of these forms have also different significations.

² The most important of these differences are, (a) those between the Orientals, i.e. the scholars of the Babylonian Schools (comp. for their peculiar vowel system, p. 40, note, below), and the Occidentals, i.e. the scholars of Palestine (Tiberias, &c.); (b) amongst the Occidentals, between Ben-Naphtali and Ben-Asher, who flourished in the first half of the tenth century at Tiberias. Both sets of variants are given by Baer in the appendices to his critical editions. Our printed editions present uniformly the text of Ben-Asher, with the exception of a few isolated readings of Ben-Naphtali, and numerous later corruptions.

to the peculiar nature of the Hebrew, the example and pattern of the older Syrian punctuation¹.

See Gesenius, *Gesch. d. hebr. Spr.* p. 182 sqq.; Hupfeld, in *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1830, pt. iii. (where it is shown that neither Jerome nor the Talmud mentions vowel signs². Comp. also Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talm. u. Midrasch*, p. 26 sqq.; and B. Pick, in *Hebraica*, i. 3, p. 153 sqq.); Abr. Geiger, 'Zur Nakdanim-[Punctuators-]Literatur,' in *Jüd. Ztschr. für Wissensch. u. Leben*, Breslau, 1872, x. p. 10 sqq.; H. Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vet. Test. Hebr.*, Lips. 1873; 'Beitrag zur Gesch. des hebr. Bibel-textes,' in *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1875, p. 736 sqq., as also in the *Ztschr. f. die ges. luth. Theol. u. K.*, 1875, p. 619 sqq.; 'Massorah,' in the *Protest. Real-Enc.* ed. 2, ix. p. 388 sqq.; M. Schwab, *Des points-voyelles dans les langues sémitiques*, Paris, 1879; A. Merx, in the *Verhandlungen des Orientalistencongresses zu Berlin*, Berlin, 1881, i. p. 164 sqq. and p. 188 sqq.; H. Graetz, 'Die Anfänge der Vokalzeichen im Hebr.,' in *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.*, 1881, pp. 348 sqq. and 395 sqq.; Hermann, *Zur Gesch. des Streites über die Entstehung der hebr. Punctuation*, Ruhrort, 1885, 4; Harris, 'The Rise ... of the Massorah,' *J. Q. R.* 1889, i. 128 sqq. and 223 sqq.; Mayer-Lambert, *Revue des études juives*, 1893, xxvi. p. 274 sqq. On the hypothesis of the origin of punctuation in the Jewish schools for children, comp. J. Dérenbourg in the *Rev. Crit.*, 1879, xiii. no. 25.

4. This vowel system is really based on the pronunciation *i* of the Jews of Palestine, as it was then in use (about the sixth century A.D.). This again is based on a much older tradition, followed in the solemn public reading of the sacred writings in the Synagogues and Schools. The consistency of the system, as well as the analogy of the kindred languages, testifies to a high degree of faithfulness in the tradition. This was represented with such exactness, that special signs were invented even for the more minute gradations of the vowels and vowel trills (§ 10), as well as for the involuntary helping vowels which in other languages are but seldom indicated by the writing. At the same recension of the text also the various other signs for reading (§§ 11-14, 16) were added, and the accents (§ 15).

¹ Comp. for this, Geiger, 'Massorah bei d. Syrern,' in *ZDMG.* 1873, p. 148 sqq.; J. P. Martin, *Hist. de la ponctuation ou de la Massore chez les Syriens*, Par. 1875; E. Nestle, in *ZDMG.* 1876, p. 525 sqq.; Weingarten, *Die syr. Massora nach Bar Hebraeus*, Halle, 1887.

² Jerome expressly states that punctuation was not found in the texts of his time. He refers however to the vowel signs, see his Commentary on Is. 26, 14. Jer. 9, 21, &c.; also Bleek's *Einleitung*, 3rd ed. § 330.—G. W. C.]

§ 8. *The Vowel Signs in particular.*

- a* 1. The full vowels (in contrast to the half-vowels or vowel trills, § 10. 1, 2), classified according to the three principal vowel sounds (§ 7. 1, 2), are as follows:—

First Class. A-sound.

- A* { 1. — ¹ *Qāmēš*, *ā*, *ā*², *יָ* *yād* (hand); *רָאִים* *rāšim* (chiefs).
2. — *Pāthāh*, *ā*, *בָּ* *bāth* (daughter).

Also 3. — *S'ghōl*, an open *e*, *ē* (*ā*), as a modification of *ā*², either in an untuned syllable and consequently as a short⁴ vowel, as in the first syllable of *יָדְךָ* *yād'khēm* (your hand) from *yād'khēm*—or in a tone-syllable as a half lengthening of *ā*, (the full lengthening would require *Qāmēš*), as in *פֶּסַח* *pēsāh* (פֶּסַח). Also with a following *י*, as *גְּלֵנָה* (cf. § 75. 2); *יָדְדֵכָה* (cf. § 91. 2, end).

Second Class. I- and E-sounds.

- b* { 1. '— or — (defectively written, see No. 4) *Hfrēq longum* (*magnum*), *ל*, e.g. *פַּדְדִּיקִים* *pad'dīqīm* (righteous).
I { 2. — *Hfrēq breve* (*parvum*), *י*, *יִקְוֹל*.
3. '— *Šērē* or *Šērē* with *yod*, and — *Šērē* without *yod*, the former *ē*, the latter mostly *i*, e.g. *בֵּית* *bēth* (house), *שֵׁם* *šēm* (name). Less frequently — (defective, see No. 4) for *ē*.
E { 4. — *S'ghōl*, *ē*, a modification of *i*, e.g. *יִפְתָּ* (ground-form *hīphs*); *יִנְ* (ground-form *šin*).

¹ In early MSS. the sign for *Qamēš* is a stroke with a point underneath, i. e. according to Nestle's discovery (*ZDMG.* 1892, p. 411 sq.), *Pathah* with *Holem*, the latter suggesting the obscure pronunciation of *Qamēš* as *ā* or *o*.

² The notation *ā*, *ē*, *ō* expresses here the vowels essentially long, either naturally or by contraction; the notation *ā*, *ē*, *ō* those lengthened only by the tone, and therefore changeable; *ā*, *ē*, *ō* the short vowels. (On *ē* comp. the remark at the end of the A-class.) As regards the others, the distinction into *i* and *i*, *u* and *u* is sufficient; see § 9.—The mark ⁴ stands in the following pages over the tone-syllable, especially if this is not the last, as is usual, but the penultimate syllable of the word, e.g. *פֶּסַח*. Comp. § 15, Rem. 2.

³ These *S'ghōls*, modified from *ā*, are very frequent in the language. The Babylonian punctuation (see below, p. 40, note) has for it and tone-bearing *Pathah* only one sign; see also Gaster in *ZAW.* 1894, p. 60 sqq.

⁴ It must be mentioned that the Masoretes are not concerned with any distinction between long and short vowels, or in general with any question of quantity. Their efforts are directed to fixing the received pronunciation as faithfully as

Third Class. *U- and O-sounds.*

- U' { 1. שָׁרֵק *Šarēq*, *ā*, מָוּת *mūth* (to die), rarely also for *ū*. c
 2. — *Qibbās*, both for *ū*, e.g. מִלָּמָה *millām* (ladder), and *ū*, e.g. מָשָׁה *(rise up)* instead of the usual מָשָׁה.
- O { 3. י and — *Hölēm*, *ō* and *ō*, קוֹל *qōl* (voice), רֹב *rōbh* (multitude).
 Often also a defective — for *ō*; rarely י for *ō*.
 4. — *Qāmēs-hatāph*, *ō*, e.g. מִצְוָה *hōq* (statute).
 5. The tone-bearing *ē* in אַתָּם *'attēm* (you), and a few other cases (comp. § 27, Rem. 4 *ō*), is perhaps to be considered as a weakening of an original *u*.

The names of the vowels are nearly all taken from the form and action of the *d* mouth in producing the various sounds, as פִּתּוּחַ *opening*; צִיר *division, parting* (of the mouth), also שִׁבּוּר *breaking* (comp. the Arab. *kasr*); חִירָק (also חִירָק) *gnashing*; חִוּלָם *closing*, according to others *fullness*, i.e. of the mouth (also פִּלּוּל *fullness of the mouth*); שִׁירָק *a whistle* (*συσφύς*); קִבּוּץ *contraction* (of the mouth). מִצְוָה¹ has also the same signification.

That the long *a* and the short *o* (חִוּלָם *Qāmēs corruptum*) have the same sign and name, arises from the fact that the inventors of the vowel signs pronounced the *ā* rather obscurely and similarly to *o*, just as it afterwards passed into a full *o* among modern German and Polish Jews (comp. the Syriac *ō* in the West-Syrian pronunciation = *ō*, the Swedish *ä*, and the early weakening of *ā* to *ō*, even in Hebrew, § 9. 10, 2)². On the rules for distinguishing *ā* and *ō*, see § 9. 12, Rem. *S'ghöl* (סִגְוֹל *bunch of grapes*) takes its name from its form. So שְׁלֹשׁ נְקֻדּוֹת (*three points*) is another name for *Qibbās*.

Moreover the names were mostly so formed, that the sound of each vowel *e* is heard in the first syllable; in order to carry out this consistently some even write *Sägöl*, *Qomes-hatāf*, *Qübbās*.

possible, by means of writing. For a long time only שִׁבְעָה מְלָכִים *seven kings* were reckoned (*vox memor.* in Elias Levita, מִלְכֵי אֲשִׁירָה, *Šureq* and *Qibbās* being counted as one vowel. The division of the vowels in respect of quantity is a later attempt at a scientific conception of the phonetic system, which was not invented but only represented by the Masoretes (Qimchi, *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb. 136 *a*, distinguishes the five long, as *mothers* from their five daughters).

¹ The usual spelling מִצְוָה takes the word (as also פִּתּוּחַ) as a Hebrew substantive; according to De Lagarde (*Gött. gel. Ans.* 1886, p. 873, and so previously Luzzatto), מִצְוָה and פִּתּוּחַ are rather Aram. participles, like *Dageš*, &c., and consequently to be transliterated by *Qdmēz* and *Pdthah*.

² In the *Babylonian* punctuation (see the following note) *ā* and *ō* are carefully distinguished, as well as in many manuscripts with the common punctuation, and so in Baer's editions since 1880 (by addition of a *Šwā* to indicate even the full vowel *ō*). It is however probable that the two signs were identical in the original system.

f 2. As the above examples show, the vowel sign stands regularly *under* the consonant, *after* which it is to be pronounced, ר̣ *rā*, ר̣ *rā*, ר̣ *rē*, ר̣ *rū*, &c. The *Pathah* called *furtivum* (§ 22. 2 *b*) alone forms an exception to this rule, being pronounced *before* the consonant, ר̣ *rā*ḥ (wind, spirit). The *Hölēm* (without *wāw*) stands on the left above the consonant, ר̣ *rō* (but ר̣ = *lō*). If א, as a vowel letter, follows a consonant which is to be pronounced with *ō*, the point is placed over its right arm, thus א̣, א̣. On the other hand, e.g. א̣, since א is here at the same time the initial sound of a syllable.

g No dot is placed for the *Holem* when *ō* (of course without *wāw*) is pronounced after *šin* or before *šin*. Hence א̣ *šnē* (hating), א̣ *nēšō* (to bear), מ̣ *mšē* (not מ̣); but מ̣ *šmēr* (a watchman). When *ō* precedes the *šin*, the dot is placed over its right arm, e.g. מ̣ *špōš* (he treads with the feet), א̣ *hannōšīm* (those who carry).

In the sign י̣, the י may be also a consonant. The י̣ is then either to be read *ōw* (necessarily so when a consonant otherwise without a vowel precedes, e.g. מ̣ *lōwē*, lending) or *wō*, when a vowel already precedes the י, e.g. מ̣ *šwōn* (iniquity) for מ̣. In more exact printing, a distinction is at least made between י̣ (*wō*) and י̣ (i. e. either *ō* or, when another vowel follows the *wāw*, *ōw*¹).

¹ Since 1846 we have become acquainted with a system of vocalization different in many respects from the common method. The vowel signs, all except י̣, are there placed *above* the consonants, and differ almost throughout in form, and some even as regards the sound which they denote: ֿ = *ā*, ֿ = tone-bearing *ā* and *ē*, ֿ = *ē*, ֿ = *ī*, ֿ = *ū*. In an unsharpened syllable ֿ = toneless *ā* and *ē*, and also *Ḥateph Pathah*; ֿ = toneless *ē* and *Ḥateph Seghōl*; ֿ = *ī*, ֿ = *ū*, ֿ = *ō*, and *Ḥateph Qames*. Lastly before Dages, ֿ = *a*, ֿ = *ē*, ֿ = *i*, ֿ = *ū*, ֿ = *ō*. Šwā is ֿ. The accents differ less and stand in many cases under the line of the consonants. For the older literature on this *Babylonian punctuation* (פְּנִיָּהּ), as it is called, see A. Harkavy and H. L. Strack's *Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschr. der Kaiserl. öffentl. Bibliothek zu St. Petersburg*, S. Petersburg. and Leipz. 1875, parts i. and ii. p. 223 sqq. A more thorough study of the system was made possible by H. Strack's facsimile edition of the *Prophetarum posteriorum codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* (S. Petersburg., 1876, gr. fol.) of the year 916, which Firkowitsch discovered in 1839, in the Synagogue at Tschufutkale in the Crimea (comp. Strack's *Prolegomena* on the history of the Codex, the entire literature on the Babylonian punctuation, and other MSS. with that system). Strack edited a fragment of this Codex in *Hosea et Joel prophetæ ad fidem cod. Babyl. Petrop.*, S. Petersburg. 1875. Comp. also the publication by A. Merx, quoted above at the end of § 7. 3, and his *Chrestomathia Targumica*, Berlin, 1888; and G. Margoliouth, in the *Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archaeology*, xv. 4. According to the opinion formerly prevailing, this Babylonian punctuation exhibits the system which was developed in the Eastern schools, corresponding to and contemporaneous with the Western

3. The vowels of the first class are, with the exception of 'ֿֿֿ *h* in the middle and הֿֿֿ, אֿֿֿ, וֿֿֿ at the end of the word (§ 9. 1, 3), represented *only* by vowel signs (§ 7. 2), but the long vowels of the I- and U-class largely by vowel letters. The vowel sound to which the letter points, is determined more precisely by the vowel sign standing before, above, or within them. Thus—

ֿ may be combined with *Hirëq*, *Šerë*, *Sghöl* (ֿֿֿ, ֿֿֿ, ֿֿֿ).

ֿ with *Šärëq* and *Hölëm* (ֿֿֿ and ֿֿֿ)¹.

In Arabic the long *a* is also regularly expressed by a vowel letter, viz. 'Alîph (אֿֿֿ), so that in that language three vowel letters correspond to the three vowel classes. In Hebrew א is rarely used as a vowel letter; see § 9. 1 and § 23. 3, Rem. 1.

4. The omission of the vowel letters with the *long* vowels of the I- and U-class, is called *scriptio defectiva* in contrast to *scriptio plena*. לֶקֶח, דָּם are written *plene*, לָקַח, דָּם *defective*.

So far as the choice of the full or defective mode of writing *k* is concerned, there are certainly some cases in which only the one or the other is admissible. Thus the full form is necessary at the end of the word, for *a*, *ä*, *ö*, *é*, *ê*, as well as for *i* in חֵן &c. (§ 9. 3), also generally with *a*, *ä* (comp. however § 9. *d*), e. g. קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתָּ, רָדִי, מָלַכְתִּי (but the Masora requires in Jer. 26, 6. 44, 8; Ezr. 6, 21; 2 Chr. 32, 13 מָלַךְ which is for מָלַךְ; Zeph. 2, 9 מָלַךְ for מָלַךְ; Is. 40, 31 וְקָם for וְקָם; Jer. 38, 11 וְקָם for וְקָם). On the other hand the defective writing is common when the letter, which would have to be employed as a vowel letter, immediately precedes as a strong consonant, e. g. מָלִיךְ (*nations*) for מְלִיכִים, מְצַוֶּה (*commandments*) for מְצַוִּים.

or Tiberian system. Of these a higher degree of originality, or approximation to the original of both systems of punctuation, was generally conceded to the latter. Recently, however, Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, Oxford, 1887, p. 142 sqq., has proved, from the accents, that the 'Babylonian' punctuation may certainly be an Oriental, but is by no means the Oriental system. It is rather to be regarded, according to him, as a later and not altogether successful attempt to modify, and thus to simplify, the system common to all the Schools in the East and West. G. Moore, *Proceedings of the American Or. Society*, Oct. 1888, established the probability that the vowels of the superlinear punctuation arose under *Arab* influence from the vowel letters אֵ (so previously Pinsker and Graetz), while the Tiberian system shows *Syrian* influence.

¹ After the example of the Jewish grammarians the expression, 'the vowel letter rests (*quiesces*) in the vowel-sign,' has become customary. On the other hand, the vowel letters are also called by the grammarians, *matres lectionis* or *supports* (*fulcra*).

l That much is here arbitrary (see § 7. 2 *c*), follows from the fact that now and then the same word is written very differently, e.g. *הַקִּימוֹתִי* Ez. 16, 60: *הַקִּמּוֹתִי* or even *הַקִּמּוֹתִי* Jer. 23, 4; comp. § 25. 1. Only it may be observed,

(*a*) That the defective mode of writing was chosen in preference, when the word included also other vowel letters, so that the accumulation of them was avoided; comp. e.g. *צִדִּיק*, but *צִדִּיקִים*; *קוֹל*, *קָלוֹת*; *יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*, *יְהוֹשֻׁעַי*, *יְהוֹשֻׁעַיִם*.

(*b*) That in the later Books of the Old Test. the full form, in the earlier the defective, is more usual.

III 5. In the cognate dialects, when a vowel precedes a vowel letter which is not kindred (heterogeneous), e.g. *וֹ*, *וְ*, *וִ*, *וּ*, *וֹ*, a diphthong (*au*, *ai*) is formed if the heterogeneous vowel be *a*. This is also to be regarded as the Old Hebrew pronunciation, as the transcription of Hebrew names in the LXX further testifies. Thus such words as *וְ*, *וִי*, *וֵי*, *וְשֵׁי*, *וֵי*, *וֵי*, *וֵי* are not to be pronounced according to the usual Jewish custom¹ as *wāw*, *hay*, *ghy*, *‘āsūy*, *gēw*, *bayih*, (or even as *waw*, &c.; comp. modern Greek *av*, *ev* for *av*, *ev*), but with the Italian Jews more like *wāu*, *hai*, &c. The sound of *וִ* is the same as *וֹ*, i.e. almost like *āu*, so that *וֹ* is often written defectively for *וִ*.

§ 9. *Character of the several Vowels.*

a Numerous as are the vowel signs in Hebrew writing, they are yet inadequate to express completely the various modifications of the vowel sounds, especially with respect to length and shortness. To understand this better a short explanation of the character and value of the several vowels is required, especially in regard to their length and shortness as well as to their changeableness (§§ 25, 27).

I. *First Class. A-sound.*

1. *Qames* (ֿ) is everywhere long a, but according to its nature and origin is of two kinds:—

(1) the essentially long a (in Arabic regularly written *ā*), which is not readily shortened and never wholly dropped (§ 25. 2), e.g. *גָּנָב* *gānābh* (writing), *גַּנֵּב* *gānābh* (thief); very seldom with a following *ā*, as *שָׂאָה* 2 Sam. 12, 1. 4 (see the examples in § 72, Rem. 1)².

¹ In MSS. *ו* and *וִ*, in such combinations as *וֵי*, *וִי*, are occasionally even marked with Mappiq (§ 14. 1).

² Of a different kind are the cases in which *ā* has lost its consonantal sound by coalescing with a preceding *a*, § 23. 1, 2.

The writing of **דָּגֵךְ** Hos. 10, 14 for **דָּג** would only be justifiable, if the *ā* of this form were to be explained as a contraction of *da*; comp. however the note on § 72. 2; **דָּגֵךְ** Neh. 13, 16 for **דָּג** (*dāg*) is certainly incorrect. The rarity of the naturally long *ā* in Hebrew arises from the fact that it has for the most part become an obtuse *ā*; see below, No. 10. 2.

(2) *ā*, lengthened only by prosody (i.e. tone-long or at all events *c* lengthened under the influence of the tone, according to the laws for the formation of syllables, § 27. 2), as well in the tone-syllable itself, (or in the secondary tone-syllable indicated by *Mithg*, see below,) as before or after it. This sound is invariably lengthened¹ from an original *ā*, and is found in open syllables, i.e. syllables ending in a vowel (§ 26. 3), e.g. **לָכָה**, **קָאִלָה**, **יָאֻמָה** (Arab. *lākā, qā'ilā, yā'ūm*, 'āsr), as well as in closed syllables, i.e. those ending in a consonant, as **יָדָה**, **עָזָה** (Arab. *yād, kaukāb*). In a closed syllable however it can only stand when this has the tone, **יָדָה**, **עָזָה**; whereas in an open syllable it is especially frequent before the tone, e.g. **יָדָה**, **עָזָה**. Where the tone is moved forward or weakened (as happens most commonly in what is called the construct state of nouns, comp. § 89. 1) the short *ā* (*Pathah*) is apt to re-appear in a closed syllable; while in an open syllable *Qameṣ* becomes *Ṣwā* (§ 27. 3); **קָמֵץ**, constr. state **קָמֵץ** (*kākhām*); **יָדָה**, **עָזָה** (*ābhār*); **לָכָה**, **קָאִלָה**. For examples of the retention, in the secondary tone-syllable, of *ā* lengthened from *a*, see § 16. 2 *a* and *b*, *a*; also § 93. 4, Rem. 3.

In some terminations of the verb (**יָדָה** in the 2nd sing. masc. *d* perf., **יָדָה** in the 2nd pl. fem. of the imperat., as well as in the 2nd and 3rd pl. fem. of the imperf.), in **יָדָה** *thou* (masc.) and in the suffixes **יָדָה** and **יָדָה**, the final *ā* can stand even without a vowel letter. A **יָדָה** is however in these cases (except with **יָדָה**) frequently added as a vowel letter.

2. *Pathah*, or short *ā*, stands in Hebrew almost exclusively in *e* a closed syllable with or without the tone (**יָדָה**, **קָאִלָה**). In places where it now appears to stand in an open syllable the syllable was originally closed, and became half open only by the insertion of a helping vowel (*ā, i, ē*) in the second syllable, e.g. **יָדָה** (ground-form *nahā*), **יָדָה** (Arab. *bait*), see § 28. 4, and with regard to two cases of a different kind, § 26. 3 *b* and *c*. Otherwise *Pathah* in an

¹ In Arabic this *ā* is everywhere retained in an open syllable.

open syllable has almost without exception passed into *ā* (—), see above, No. 1. 2.

On the very frequent attenuation of *ā* to *i*, comp. below, No. 5. On the rare, and only apparent union of Pathah with *ā* (—), see § 23. 2. On *ā* as a helping-vowel, § 22. 2 *b* (*Pathah furtivum*), and § 28. 4.

- f* 3. *Sēghôl* (ז, è) by origin belongs sometimes to the second, more rarely to the third, and most frequently to the first vowel class (§ 27, Rem. 1, 2, 4). It belongs to the first class when it is a modified form of *a*, (as the Germ. *Bad*, pl. *Bäder*; *Land*, pl. *Länder*,) either in a toneless syllable, e. g. דָּבָר (for *yad'khèm*), or with the tone, e. g. אֶרֶץ from *'ars*, אֶרֶץ Arab. *qārū*, אֶמֶל Arab. *qāmā*. This *Sēghôl* is often retained even in the strongest tone-syllable, at the end of a sentence or of a prominent division of a sentence, (in *pause*,) as אֶלְמָלְכָא, אֶלְמָלְכָא. As a rule however in such cases the *Pathah* which underlies the *è* is lengthened into *Qameṣ*, e. g. אֶלְמָלְכָא, אֶלְמָלְכָא. A *Sēghôl* apparently lengthened from *šwā*, but in reality traceable to an original *ā*, stands in pausal forms, as אֶרֶץ (ground-form *pāry*), אֶלְמָלְכָא (*yāhy*), &c. On the cases where a *ʾ* (originally consonantal) follows this *Sēghôl*, see § 75. 2, and § 91. 2, Rem. 1.

II. Second Class. *I- and E-sounds.*

- g* 4. The long *i* is frequently even in the consonantal writing indicated by the letter *ʾ* (a fully written *Hireq* '—); but a naturally long *i* can, by an orthographic license, be also written *defectively* (§ 8. 4), e. g. צַדִּיק (righteous), plur. צַדִּיקִים *ṣaddīqīm*; יָרֵא (he fears), plur. יָרֵאִים. Whether a *defectively* written *Hireq* is long, may be best known from the origin of the form; often also from the nature of the syllable (§ 26), or as in יָרֵא from the *Melheg* attached to it (§ 16. 2).
- h* 5. The short *Hireq* (always¹ written *defectively*) is especially frequent in sharpened syllables (אֶלְמָלְכָא), and in toneless closed syllables (אֶלְמָלְכָא *psalm*); comp. however אֶלְמָלְכָא in a closed tone-syllable, and even אֶלְמָלְכָא in a loosely closed tone-syllable. It has arisen very frequently by attenuation from *ā*, as in אֶלְמָלְכָא from אֶלְמָלְכָא, אֶלְמָלְכָא (ground-form *šādq*)², or else it is the original *i*, which in the tone-syllable

¹ At least according to the Masoretic orthography; cf. Wellhausen's *Text der Bb. Sam.* p. 18, Rem.

² Jerome (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW.* 1884, p. 77) in these cases often gives *ā* for *i*.

had become \bar{e} , as in אֹיֶב (*thy enemy*) from אֵיֶב (ground-form 'dyib). It is sometimes a simple helping vowel, as in בֵּית , § 28. 4.

The earlier grammarians call every *Hireq* written fully, *Hireq magnum*; every one written defectively, *Hireq parvum*,—an inaccurate distinction, so far as quantity is concerned.

6. The longest \bar{e} ' (more rarely defective —, e.g. עֵינִי for עֵינִי *i* Is. 3, 8; at the end of a word also הֵן) is as a rule contracted from ' = *ay* (*ai*), § 7. 1, e.g. הַיֵּכָל (*palace*), Arab. and Syriac *haikal*.

7. The *Šere* without *Yôdh* mostly represents the tone-long \bar{e} , *k* which, like the tone-long \bar{a} (No. 1. 2), is very rarely retained except *in* and *before* the tone-syllable, and is always lengthened from an original \bar{i} . It stands in an open syllable with or before the tone, e.g. סִפְרָה (ground-form *siphr*) *book*, שְׁנָה (Arab. *šmāt*) *sleep*, or with *Metheg* (see § 16. 2 *a* and *b*, *a*) in the secondary tone-syllable, e.g. שְׂאֵלָתִי *my request*, $\\text{נִלְכְּהָ}$ *let us go*. On the other hand in a closed syllable it is almost always with the tone, as זֶן *son*, דֹּמֵם *dumb*.

Exceptions: (*a*) \bar{e} is sometimes retained in a toneless closed syllable, in monosyllabic words before *Maqqeph*, e.g. נִמְרָה Num. 35, 18, as well as in the examples of *nāstg* 'āhōr mentioned in § 29. 3 *b*; (*b*) in a toneless open final syllable, *Šere* likewise occurs in examples of the *nāstg* 'āhōr, as נִצְרָה Ex. 16, 29; comp. Jud. 9, 39.

8. The *Seghōl* of the I(E)-class is most frequently an obtuse \bar{e} , *m* a modification of an original \bar{i} , either replacing (on loss of the tone) a tone-long \bar{e} , e.g. תֵּן from תֵּן (*give*), יִצְרָה (*thy creator*) from יִצֵּר , or in the case discussed in § 93. 1, Rem. 2, עֲוִירִי from the ground-forms *hīlq*, 'izr; comp. also § 64, Rem. 1. *Seghōl* appears as a simple helping-vowel in cases such as סִפְרָה for *siphr*, יִגְלָה for *yigl* (§ 28. 4).

III. Third Class. U- and O-sounds.

9. In the U-sound there is to be distinguished—

(1) the long \bar{u} , either (*a*) written fully, שֹׁרֶק (*Šureq* (corresponding to the ' — of the second class), e.g. גְּבוּל (*boundary*), or (*b*) defectively written — *Qibbûs* (analogous to the long — of the second class), יִמְתֵּן , גְּבֻלָּה ;

(2) the short \bar{u} , *Qibbûs* proper (corresponding to the short *Hireq*), in a toneless closed syllable and especially in a sharpened syllable, in e.g. שִׁלְחָן (*table*), סִפְתָּה (*booth*).

o Sometimes also *ū* in a sharpened syllable is written *plene*, e.g. הַזֶּה Ps. 102, 5, זֶה Jer. 31, 34 for זֶה, זֶה.

For this *u* the LXX put *o*, e.g. וְעָרָה 'Oδωλλάμ, from which however it only follows, that this *ū* was pronounced somewhat indistinctly. The LXX also express the sharp *Hireq* by *e*, e.g. עָרָה = 'Εμμήρ. The pronunciation of the *Qibbāṣ* like the German *ū*, which was formerly common, is incorrect, although the occasional pronunciation of the U-sounds as *ū* in the time of the punctators must be admitted, at least as regards Palestine¹; comp. the Turkish *būlbūl* for the Persian *bulbul*, and the pronunciation of the Arabic *dunyā* in Syria as *dūnyā*.

p 10. The O-sound bears the same relation to U, as the E does to I in the second class. It has four gradations:—

(1) The *δ* which is contracted from *aw* (= *au*), § 7. 1, and accordingly is mostly written fully; יָ (*Holem plenum*), e.g. שֹׁם (*a whip*) Arab. *sauf*, עוֹלָה (*evil*) from עוֹלָה. More rarely *defectively* as שׁוֹרֶה (*thine ox*) from שׁוֹרֶה Arab. *ṣaur*.

q (2) The *long δ* which arose in Hebrew at an early period, through an extensive obscuring, out of an original *d*², while the latter has been retained in Arabic and Aramaic. It is usually written *fully* in the tone-syllable, *defectively* in the toneless, e.g. קָדִיל Arab. *qāṭil*, Aram. *qāṭēl*, קָדִילִים Arab. 'ilāh, Aram. 'lāh, plur. קָדִילִים (*leg*), Arab. *sāq*; בִּירוֹ (*hero*), Arab. *gābbār*; חֶזֶק (*seal*), Arab. *ḥāṭām*, רִפְּזִין (*pomegranate*), Arab. *rūmmān*; שְׁלִטָּה (*dominion*), Aram. שְׁלִטָּה and שְׁלִטָּה Arab. *sūlṭān*; שְׁלֵוֹם (*peace*), Aram. שְׁלֵוֹם, Arab. *sālām*. Sometimes the form in *d* also occurs side by side with that in *δ*, as שְׁרִיטָה and שְׁרִיטָה (*coat of mail*; see however § 29 at the end). Comp. also § 68. 1.

r (3) The tone-long *ō* which is lengthened from an original *ū*, or from an *ō* arising from *ū*, by the tone, or in general according to the laws for the formation of syllables. Besides the tone-syllable it also occurs in an open syllable before the tone, e.g. קֹדֶשׁ (ground-form *qūḏš*) *sanctuary*; בִּרְרָה for *burrakh*, יְלִקְטָן Ps. 104, 28, as well as (with *Metheg*) in the secondary tone-syllable; בְּעֵלִי, אֶהְיֶה. As soon as the tone is lost, or the other reasons for the lengthening are no longer operative, either the original *ō* (*ū*), in a closed syllable, returns, or, in an open syllable, a weakening to *ṣwā* takes place. Comp. כָּל (*all*), כָּלֹל (*kōl*), כָּלָלִים (*kūllām*); קָטָל, קָטָלִים and קָטָלִים, where it is weakened

¹ Comp. Delitzsch, *Physiologie u. Musik*, Lpz. 1868, p. 15 sq.

² Cf. § 8. 1 end. On Jerome's transliteration of *o* for *d*, see ZAW. 1884, p. 75.

to *Šwā*; *yiqṭālā*, Arab. *yaqtūlū*. This tone-long *o* is only as an exception written fully.

(4) — *Qameṣ-ḥaṣuph*, always short *ə*, stands in the same relation *s* to the *Holem*, as the *Sghöl* of the second class to the *Šere*, — *kəl*, — *wayyāqōm*. On the distinction between this and *Qameṣ*, see the Rem. after No. 12.

11. On the *Sghöl* as an obtuse sound of an original *u*, comp. § 27, Rem. 4 *b*.

12. The following table gives a summary of the gradation of the *t* three vowel-classes according to the quantity of the vowels:—

First Class: A.	Second Class: I and E.	Third Class: U and O.
— original long <i>ā</i> (Arabic —).	— <i>ē</i> , formerly diphthongal, from <i>ay</i> (<i>ai</i>).	— <i>ō</i> , formerly diphthongal, from <i>aw</i> (<i>au</i>).
	— or — long <i>i</i> .	— or — <i>ə</i> obtuse from <i>ā</i> . — or — long <i>ā</i> .
— tone-long <i>ā</i> (from <i>ā</i> or —) chiefly in the tone-syllable but also before it.	— tone-long <i>ē</i> (from <i>i</i>) generally in the tone-syllable but also before it.	— tone-long <i>ō</i> (from <i>ō</i> or <i>ā</i>) in the tone-syllable, otherwise in an open syllable.
— (as a modification of <i>ā</i>) sometimes a tone-long <i>ē</i> or at least one which bears the tone, sometimes <i>ē</i> .	— <i>ē</i> .	— short <i>ə</i> .
— short <i>ā</i> . [— <i>i</i> attenuated from <i>a</i> ; see No. 5.]	— short <i>i</i> .	— short <i>ā</i> , especially in a sharpened syllable.
Utmost weakening to — <i>ā</i> , — <i>ē</i> , or — <i>ē</i> .	Utmost weakening to — or — .	Utmost weakening to — or — .

Rem. On the distinction between *Qameṣ* and *Qameṣ-ḥaṣuph*¹.

11

According to § 8. 1, long *ā* (*Qameṣ*) and short *ə* (*Qameṣ-ḥaṣuph*) are in manuscripts and printed texts generally expressed by the same sign (—), e.g. — *qām*, — *kəl*. (On the marking of the *ə* by the addition of a *Šwā* (—) which is regularly done in many manuscripts, see Baer-Del., *Liber Jobi*, p. 43.) The beginner who does not yet know the grammatical origin of the words in

¹ These statements, in order to be fully understood, must be studied in connexion with the theory of syllables (§ 26) and *Metheg* (§ 16. 2).

question, (which is of course the surest guide,) may depend meanwhile on the following principal rules:—

1. *The sign (◌) is δ in a closed syllable which has not the tone*, since such a syllable can have only a short vowel (§ 26. 5). The above case occurs—

(a) When *Šwā* follows as a syllable-divider, as in חֶכְמָה ḥḥkh-mā (wisdom), אֹכֶלֶת 'ōkh-lā (food). With *Metheg* on the other hand (◌) is ā and stands in an open syllable. The following *Šwā* is then a half-vowel (*Šwā mobile*), e.g. אָכְלָה 'ā-kh-lā (she ate), according to § 16. 2.

(b) When a closed syllable is formed by *Dageš forte*, e.g. חַנּוּנִי ḥōnnēnī (have mercy upon me); but בְּרַחֲמִים (with *Metheg*, § 16. 2, 1 b) bāllīm.

(c) When the syllable in question loses the tone on account of a following *Maqqēph* (§ 16. 1), e.g. כָּל־הָאָדָם kōl-hā-'ādām (all men). In Ps. 35, 10 and Prov. 19, 7 *Maqqēph* with כָּל is replaced by a conjunctive accent (*Mer-kha*); so by *Darga*, Jud. 19, 5 with קָטַר, and Ez. 37, 8 with וַיִּקְרָא (so Baer after Qimḥi; ed. Mant. וַיִּקְרָא).

(d) In a closed final syllable without the tone, e.g. וַיָּקָם wayyāqōm (and he stood up). In the cases where *d* or *ā* has in the final syllable become toneless through *Maqqēph* (§ 16. 1) and yet must remain, e.g. כְּבֹד־הֵדֹת Esth. 4, 8, שָׁחֲלִי Gen. 4, 25, it has in correct manuscripts and printed texts a *Metheg* beside it.

In cases like הָלַמָּה, לָמָּה lāmmā, the tone shows that (◌) is to be read as ā.

2. The places in which (◌) appears to stand in an open syllable and yet is to be read as δ require special consideration. This is the case, (a) when *Ḥateph-Qames* follows (e.g. פָּעָלוֹ his work), or simple vocal *Šwā* (e.g. אֹרְכָן or good; בָּעֲבָרוֹ Jos. 4, 7; שָׁמְרוּ preserve Ps. 86, 2, comp. 16, 1; other examples are Obad. 11. Jud. 14, 15); *Ḥateph-Pathah* follows in לְמִשְׁחָה 1 Sam. 15, 1, לְהַרְנוּה 24, 11, and פָּנִישָׁךְ (so Baer, Gen. 32, 18, others יִפְנִישָׁךְ); (b) before another *Qames-hateph*, e.g. פָּעַלְתָּ thy work (but יִרְבְּעָם Yārob'ām, because from imperf. יָרַב; אֲהַרְלִי and קִבְּרִי Num. 23, 7, see § 67, Rem. 2); (c) in the two plural forms מְקִדָּשִׁים sanctuaries and שְׁרָשִׁים roots (also written מְקִדִּים and שְׁרָרִים). In all these cases the Masora puts a *Metheg* beside the (◌), which according to the statement of the Jewish grammarians, is intended to indicate that the Masora reads the ◌ as ā¹; thus pā-ōl, dā-ā-bān, pā-ōl-khā, qā-dāšīm. This tradition is in point of fact expressly confirmed by the Babylonian punctuation (see above, § 8. 2, note), which carefully distinguishes between δ and ā. Nevertheless, neither the origin of these forms, nor the analogous formations in Hebrew and in the cognate languages, nor lastly the transcribing of the proper names in the LXX, admits of this tradition being regarded as correct, whether the *Metheg* originally had

¹ Comp. Baer-Dellitzsch, *Liber Jobi*, Lpz. 1875, Preface, p. vi.

another meaning or is due to an error¹. It is better to divide and read *pō-lo* (for *pō-lo*), *pō-lo-hā*, *qōdā-šim* (strictly orthographic for *qōdāšim*). Quite as inconceivable is it for *Metheg* to be a sign of the lengthening into *ā* in מֵתֵּק (Ex. 11, 8), although it is so in בָּנִי *bā-nt* (in the navy), since here the *ā* of the article appears under the נִי.

§ 10. *The Half Vowels and the Syllable Divider* (Šwâ).

1. Besides the full vowels, Hebrew has also a series of vowel *a* sounds which may be called *half vowels*. The punctuation makes use of these to represent extremely slight sounds which are to be regarded as remains of fuller and more distinct vowels from an earlier period of the language. They generally take the place of vowels originally short standing in open syllables. Such short vowels, though preserved in the kindred languages, are not tolerated by the present system of pointing in Hebrew, but either undergo a lengthening or are weakened to Šwâ. Under some circumstances however the original short vowel may re-appear.

To these belongs first of all the sign ְ, which indicates an extremely short, slight, and (as regards pronunciation) indeterminate vowel sound, something like an obscure half *e* (é). It is called *Šwâ*² or *simple Šwâ* (*Šwâ simplex*) to distinguish it from the compound (see No. 2), and *vocal Šwâ* (*Šwâ mobile*) to distinguish it from *Šwâ quiescens*, which is silent and stands as a mere syllable divider (see No. 3) under the consonant which closes the syllable. Of the *vocal Šwâ* the following kinds are further to be distinguished:

1. The real *Šwâ mobile* under a consonant which is closely united, *c* as a kind of grace-note, with the following syllable, whether it be (a) at the beginning of the word, as קָטַל *q'tōl* (to kill), מָלֵא *m'mallē* (filling), or (b) in the middle of the word, as קוֹטֵלָה *qō-ṭlā*, יִיק־לָהּ *yiq-ṭlā*, קִיק־לָהּ *qit-ṭlā*.

2. What is called *Šwâ medium* or *wavering Šwâ* under a consonant *d* which stands at the end of a syllable containing a short vowel, and thus causes at least a partial closing of it, while serving at the same

¹ It is just conceivable that מֵתֵּק &c. (§ 93. 1, A. 3) were really intended, and that *ō* was inaccurately represented by the similarly sounding *ā*.

² Instead of שְׁוָא it would be more correct to write שְׁבָא, since the name is very probably to be referred to Aram. שְׁבָא *rest*, and hence originally, like the Arab. *sukūn* (*rest*), indicated only the *Šwâ quiescens*. Cf. C. Levia, *American Journ. of Philology*, xvi. 1, who considers שְׁבָא or שְׁיָבָא (a translation of *sukūn*) to be the original form.

time as a grace-note to the following syllable (§ 26. 2 *b*, Rem.). The *Šwā* *medium* accordingly stands half-way between the *Šwā* *quiescens* and the real *Šwā* *mobile*. In regard to pronunciation and other characteristics it is however to be reckoned with the latter; comp. e.g. לְמַנְחָה *la-m'naṣṣḥā* (for לְמַנְחָה, לְמַנְחָה *ma-ṭkḥē*, לְמַנְחָה *bin-phōl*, לְמַנְחָה *kin-phōl*).

- e* The sound *ē* may be regarded as normally representing simple *Šwā* *mobile*, although it is certain that it often became assimilated in sound to other vowels. The LXX express it by *ε*, even by *η*, לְמַנְחָה *λερουβίμ*, לְמַנְחָה *δλληλούια*, more frequently by *α*, לְמַנְחָה *Σαμουήλ*, but very frequently in such a way that this slight sound accords with the following principal vowel, e.g. לְמַנְחָה *Σόδομα*, לְמַנְחָה *Σολομών* (as well as *Σαλωμών*), לְמַנְחָה *Σαβαώθ*, לְמַנְחָה *Ναθανάη*. A similar account of the pronunciation of *Šwā* is given by Jewish grammarians of the middle ages¹.

How the *Šwā* sound has arisen through the vanishing of a full vowel is seen, e.g. in לְמַנְחָה from *bārāḥā*, as the word is still pronounced in Arabic. The latter language still regularly employs the full short vowel for the Hebrew *Šwā* *mobile*.

- f* 2. With the simple *Šwā* *mobile* is connected the compound *Šwā* or *Hāṭēph* (*correptum*), i.e. a *Šwā* the pronunciation of which is more accurately fixed by the addition of a short vowel. There are three compound *Šwās* formed in this way, corresponding to the three vowel classes (§ 7. 1):—

(---) *Hāṭēph-Pāthāḥ*, e.g. לְמַנְחָה *h'mōr*, ass.

(---) *Hāṭēph-Sgōl*, e.g. לְמַנְחָה *'mōr*, to say.

(---) *Hāṭēph-Qāmṣ*, e.g. לְמַנְחָה *h'ḥ*, sickness.

These *Hāṭēphs*, or at least the first two, stand chiefly under the four guttural letters (§ 22. 3), instead of a simple *Šwā* *mobile*, since these letters by their nature require a more precise utterance of the otherwise indeterminate simple *Šwā* *mobile*. Accordingly a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the *Šwā* is necessarily vocal, can never have a mere *Šwā* *simplex*.

- g* Rem. A. Only (---) and (---) occur under letters which are not gutturals. *Hāṭēph-Pāthāḥ* is found instead of simple *Šwā* (especially *Šwā* *mobile*), chiefly

¹ The same occurs frequently also in the Greek and Latin transcriptions of Phoenician words, e.g. לְמַנְחָה *Malaga*, לְמַנְחָה *gubulim* (Schröder, *Die phöniz. Spr.*, p. 139 sqq.). Comp. the Latin augment in *momordi*, *pupugi*, with the Greek in *τένυφα*, *τενυμένος*, and the old form *memordi*.

² See especially *Yehuda Hayyāḡ*, pp. 4 sq. and 130 sq. of the edition by Nutt (Lond. 1870), corresponding to p. 200 of the edition by Dukes (Stuttg. 1844); Ibn Ezra's *Šaḥoth*, p. 3; Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache*, p. 68. The *Manuel du lecteur*, mentioned above, § 6. 1, also contains express rules for the various ways of pronouncing *Šwā* *mobile*: so too the *Dikduke ha-ṣ'amim*, ed. by Baer and Strack, Lpz. 1879, p. 12 sqq. Cf. also Schreiner, *ZAW.* vi. 236 sqq.

(a) under doubled consonants, since this doubling causes a more distinct pronunciation of the *Šwā mobile*, שְׁפָלִי *branches*, Zach. 4, 12. According to the rule given by Ben-Asher, the *Ḥateph* is *necessary*¹ when, in a doubled medial consonant with *Šwā* (consequently not in cases like וְהָיָה, &c.), preceded by a Pathah, the sign of the doubling (*Dageš forte*) has fallen away, e.g. הָלַלְתָּ *praise ye!* וְתִמְצְאוּהוּ Jud. 16, 16; no less universally, where after a consonant with *Šwā* the same consonant follows (for a sharper separation of the two, and hence with a *metheg* always preceding), e.g. סוֹרְרִים Ps. 68, 7; קִלְלָתְךָ Gen. 27, 13 (but not without exceptions, comp. e.g. חֲסִי־Jud. 5, 15. Is. 10, 1; צִלְלִי Jer. 6, 5, and so always הִנְנִי *behold me*, הִנְנוּ *behold us*; on כ before the suffix הָ, comp. § 20. 1 c, Rem.); also in certain forms under *Kaph* and *Resh* after a long vowel and before the tone, e.g. תִּמְצְאוּהוּ Gen. 3, 17; פָּרְכִי Ps. 103, 1 (but וְתִפְרְכֵנוּ Ps. 72, 17, cf. Jer. 4, 2. 1 Chr. 29, 20, because the tone is thrown back on to the *ā*. After *ē Šwā* remains even before the tone, as פָּרְכֵנוּ, &c.)²; (b) under initial sibilants after ו copulative, e.g. וְהָיָה Gen. 2, 12; cf. Jer. 48, 20; וְנִסְחָר Is. 45, 14; וְשָׁרָה Lev. 25, 34; וְשָׁקָה Gen. 27, 26; וְשָׁמַע Num. 23, 18. Is. 37, 17. Dan. 9, 18, cf. Jud. 5, 12. 1 Ki. 14, 21. 2 Ki. 9, 17. Job 14, 1. Eccl. 9, 7—to emphasize the vocal character of the *Šwā*. For the same reason under the emphatic ט in הִטְלֵנוּ Jer. 22, 28; cf. Job 33, 25; after *Qoph* in וְקָרַב Ps. 55, 22; cf. Jer. 32, 9; under *Resh* in וְרָעַם Ps. 28, 9; even under ת Ez. 26, 21; under ב Esth. 2, 8; (c) under liquids, sibilants or *Qoph* after ל, e.g. וְיָצִיחַ Gen. 21, 6, comp. 30, 38 and Ez. 21, 28 (under ק); וְאָמְרוּ Ps. 12, 7; וְהִתְמַלֵּךְ Jer. 22, 15; כְּנִירוֹת Josh. 11, 2; וְבִסְכֶּכֶד Ps. 74, 5, for the same reason as the cases under (b)³; according to Baer also in שְׁפָמוֹת 1 Sam. 30, 28; וְיִפְגְּשֶׁךָ Gen. 32, 18 after ש (comp. § 9. 12, Rem. 2), as well as after *a* in וְהִשְׁבִּיחָה Dan. 9, 19; וְהִבְרַכָּה Gen. 27, 38; וְהִמְצָרְעִים 2 Ki. 7, 8.

B. The *Ḥateph-Qames* is less restricted to the gutturals than the first two, and stands frequently for a simple *Šwā mobile* when an O-sound was originally in the syllable, and requires to be partly preserved, e.g. at the beginning, in רָאָי (ground-form *rā'y*) *vision* (comp. § 93. 1, Rem. 6); וְנִנְיָהוּ 2 Chr. 31, 12, &c., *Q're* (*K'eth*. "כוֹנִי") *Ammonitish women*, 1 Kings 11, 1 (sing. עַמּוֹנִית. *עַמּוֹנִית*); וְיִרְדְּפָךָ Ez. 35, 6, from יִרְדֵּף; וְיִרְדְּפֵנוּ Num. 23, 25. Jer. 31, 33, and elsewhere before suffixes, comp. § 60; וְיִרְדְּפֵךָ *his palé* (from יִרְדֵּף) Ps. 7, 17 and elsewhere; וְיִשְׁקָתָה Is. 18, 4 *Q're*. Further, like —, it stands under consonants, which ought to have *Dageš forte*, as in וְלִקְחָהּ (for וְלִקְחָהּ) Gen. 2, 23. 'In this example, as in וְיִסְעָה 1 Ki. 13, 7; וְיִסְעָה 2 Ki. 7, 18; and וְיִצְעָקִי Jer. 22, 20, the *Ḥateph-Qames* is due to the influence of the following guttural as well as of the preceding

¹ See Delitzsch, 'Bemerkungen über masoretisch treue Darstellung des alttestam. Textes,' in the *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1863, vol. xxiv. p. 409 sqq.

² On the uncertainty of the MSS. in some cases which come under (a), see *Minhat shay* on Gen. 12, 3 and Jud. 7, 6.

³ Ben-Asher requires — for — (even for *Šwā quiescens*) generally before a guttural or ר; therefore Baer reads in Ps. 18, 7 אֶקְרָא; 49, 15 לִשְׁאוֹל; 65, 5 תִּבְחָר; 68, 24 תִּמְצְאוּ; Prov. 30, 17 תִּלְעַגְנִי; Job 29, 25 אֶבְחָר; comp. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 4th ed. p. 149, note.

U-sound. (Elsewhere indeed in similar cases after *ḥ* *Ḥateph-Pathaḥ* is preferred, see above letter *b*; but with *לִקְחָהּ* compare also *קָבַלְוּ* Is. 9, 3, where the U-sound must necessarily be admitted to have an influence on the *Ṣwd* immediately following.) In *וְנִקְחָהּ* (*ḥ-hdr*) Job 17, 10 it is also due to the influence of the following O-sound. In *קָסַמְתִּי* 1 Sam. 28, 8 *Qrd*, the original form is *קָסַם*, where again the *ḥ* represents an *ḥ*. It is only through the influence of a following guttural that we can explain the forms *וְנִקְרָאָהּ* Esth. 2, 14; *נִבְהָל* Prov. 28, 22; *וְנִסְרָחָהּ* Jer. 49, 7; *וְאִשְׁמָעָהּ* Is. 27, 4; *וְאִשְׁמָעָהּ* Dan. 8, 13; *שָׁמָעָהּ* Ps. 39, 13; *וְנִסְרָחָהּ* 2 Ki. 2, 1 (Baer's ed. also in ver. 11); *וְהִקְהִיתִים* 2 Chr. 34, 12 (the Mantua edition and Opatius have *וְהִקְהִיתִים*). Finally in most of the examples which have been adduced, the influence of an emphatic sound (*p*, *ḥ*, comp. also *וְאִשְׁמָעָהּ* Ruth 2, 2, 7), or of a sibilant is at the same time to be taken into consideration.

i 3. The sign of the *simple Ṣwd* — serves also as a mere syllable divider. In this case it is disregarded in pronunciation and is called *Ṣwd quiescens*. In the middle of a word it stands under every consonant which closes a syllable; at the end of words on the other hand it is omitted except in *final* *ך* (to distinguish it better from final *ן*), e. g. *מֶלֶךְ* *king*, and in the less frequent case, where a word ends with a mute after another vowelless consonant as in *נָרַד* *nard*, *אָתָּה* *thou fem.*, *קָטַלְתָּ* *thou fem. hast killed*, *וַיִּשְׁקֶה* *and he watered*, *וַיִּשְׁבֶּה* *and he took captive*, *אֵל-תִּשְׁתָּה* *drink thou not*; comp. on the other hand *וַיִּרָא*, *וַיִּחַם*, &c.¹

k However, in the examples where a mute closes the syllable, the final *Ṣwd* comes somewhat nearer to a vocal *Ṣwd*, especially as in almost all the cases a weakening of a final vowel has taken place, viz. *אָתָּה* 'att^h from *אָתָּה* 'att^h, *קָטַלְתָּ* from *קָטַלְתִּי* (comp. in this form, the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal, even *בָּאָתָּה*, after a vowel, Gen. 16, 8. Mic. 4, 10 and elsewhere according to the readings of Baer), *וַיִּשְׁקֶה* from *וַיִּשְׁקֶה*, &c. The Arabic actually has a short vowel in analogous forms. In *נָרַד* borrowed from the Indian, as also in *קִשְׁטָה* (*qōṣṭa*) Prov. 22, 21; and in *אֵל-תִּשְׁתָּה* (*ne addas*) Prov. 30, 6 the final mute of itself attracts a vowel sound, although a very slight one.

Rem. The proper distinction between *simple Ṣwd mobile* and *quiescens* depends on a correct understanding of the formation of syllables (§ 26). The beginner may observe for the present, that (1) *Ṣwd* is always *mobile* (*a*) at the beginning of a word (except in *שָׁתִי*, *שָׁתִי* § 97. 1, note 1); (*b*) under a consonant with *Dageš forte*, e. g. *גִּיד-דָּפְחָהּ*; (*c*) after another *Ṣwd*, e. g. *יִקְרָא* *yiqrā* (except at the end of the word, see above No. 3). (2) *Ṣwd* is *quiescens* (*a*) at the end of a word (even in the *ך*); (*b*) before another *Ṣwd*.

¹ On *יָת* — as an ending of the 2nd sing. fem. perf. Qal of verbs *לִי*, see § 75, Rem. 1.

§ 11. *Other Signs which affect the Reading.*

In very close connexion with the vowel points stand the reading-signs, which were probably adopted at the same time. Besides the diacritic point over ו and ז , a point is placed within a consonant to show that it has a stronger sound, or is even doubled. On the other hand a horizontal stroke (*Rāphê*) over a consonant is a sign that it has not the stronger or double sound. According to the different purposes for which it is used the point is either (1) *Dageš forte*, a sign of doubling (§ 12); or (2) *Dageš lene*, a sign of the hard (not aspirated) pronunciation of certain consonants (§ 13); or (3) *Mappiq*, a sign to bring out the full consonantal value of letters which may otherwise serve as vowel letters (§ 7. 2) especially in the case of ה at the end of the word (§ 14. 1). The *Rāphê*, which excludes the insertion of any of these points, has almost entirely gone out of use in our printed texts (§ 14. 2).

§ 12. *Dageš in general¹, and Dageš forte in particular.*

1. *Dageš*, a point standing in the middle of a consonant², denotes, according to § 11, (a) the doubling³ of a consonant (*Dageš forte*), e.g. קָטַל *qittāl*; or (b) the harder pronunciation of the letters $\text{בּ דּ גּ פּ טּ צּ$ (*Dageš lene*). For a variety of the latter, now rarely used in our printed texts, see § 13. 2, Rem.

The root דָּגַשׁ signifies in Syriac to pierce through, to bore through (with sharp iron); hence the name *Dageš* is commonly explained, solely with reference to its form, by puncture, point. But the names of all similar signs are derived rather from their grammatical significance. Accordingly דָּגַשׁ might have the meaning which the Masora assigns to it: acuere (literam), i. e. to sharpen a letter (by doubling it), as well as to harden it, i. e. to pronounce it as hard and without aspiration. Consequently דָּגַשׁ *acuens (literam)* is a sign of sharpening and hardening

¹ Comp. Graetz, 'Die mannigfache Anwendung u. Bedeut. des Dagesch,' in *Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judent.*, 1887, pp. 425 sqq. and 473 sqq.

² *Wāw* with *Dageš* (3) cannot in our printed texts be distinguished from a *wāw* pointed as *Šārēq* (3); in the latter case the point should stand higher up. The 3 is however easily to be recognized since it cannot take a vowel before or under it.

³ Stade, *Lehrb. der hebr. Gr.*, Lpz. 1879, pp. 44, 103, requires, instead of the term doubling, that of strengthened pronunciation, since the consonant in question is only once represented. No doubt this is correct, but the common expression is in some degree justifiable, since the transcription of one of these strengthened consonants can only be effected by writing it as double.

(like *Mappiq* מַפִּיק *proferens* as *signum prolationis*), for both of which purposes the same *prick* of the *pen*, or *puncture*, was selected. The opposite of *Dageš* is רֶפֶה *sof*, § 14. 2 (comp. for this § 22. 4, Rem. 1).

- c 2. Its use in the Grammar as *Dageš forte* or a *sign of doubling* is especially important, corresponding to the *sicilicus* of the *Latins* (*Luculus* for *Lucullus*) or to the stroke over the German *m̄* and *n̄*. In the unpointed text it is omitted, like the vowels and other reading signs.

For the different kinds of *Dageš forte*, comp. § 20.

§ 13. *Dageš lene*.

- a 1. *Dageš lene*, the sign of *hardening*, is in ordinary printed texts placed only within the מִתְּחִלָּה letters (§ 6. 3) as a sign that they should be pronounced with their original hard sound (without aspiration), e. g. מִלֵּךְ *mèlèkh*, but מַלְכֹּךְ *mal-kô*; תִּפְחָר *tāphār*, but יִתְפֹּר *yith-pôr*; שִׁתָּה *šāthā*, but יִשְׁתָּה *yīš-lē*.
- b 2. The cases in which a *Dageš lene* is to be inserted may be learned from § 21. It occurs almost exclusively at the beginning of words and syllables. In the middle of the word it can easily be distinguished from *Dageš forte*, since the latter always has a vowel before it, whereas *Dageš lene* never has; accordingly the *Dageš* in אֶפְרַיִם *apph*, רַבִּים *rabbīm* must be *forte*, but in יִגְדַּל *yigdal* it is *lene*.
- c A variety of the *Dageš lene* is the point which in many manuscripts, as well as in Baer's editions, is employed in consonants other than the *B'gadh'phath* to call attention expressly to the beginning of a new syllable: (a) when the same consonant precedes in close connexion, e. g. מִלֵּךְ *Ps. 9, 2*, where, owing to the *Dageš*, the coalescing of the two *Lameds* is avoided; (b) in cases like מִדְּבַר *Ps. 62, 8 = mād'-sā* (not *māh'-sā*); (c) according to some (including Baer; not in ed. Mant.) in לֵל in the combination לֵלָה *Deut. 32, 5*, or לֵלָה *Gen. 38, 9*. *Hab. 1, 6. 2, 6* and elsewhere. For other cases see below, § 20. e and g.—Delitzsch appropriately gives the name of *Dageš orthophonicum* to this variety of *Dageš* (*Bibl. Kommentar*, 1874, on *Ps. 64, 12*); comp. moreover Delitzsch, *Luth. Ztschr.*, 1863, p. 413; also his *Complutensische Varianten zu dem Alttest. Texte*, Lpz. 1878, p. 12.
- d 3. When *Dageš forte* is placed in a *B'gadh'phath*, the doubling excludes its aspiration, since the latter of the two consonants would necessarily have *Dageš lene*, e. g. אֶפְרַיִם (from אֶפְרַיִם) properly '*ap-pl*'.

§ 14. *Mappiq and Rāphè.*

1. *Mappiq*, like *Dageš*, also a point *within* the consonant, serves in *a* the letters ו, נ, מ as a sign that they are to be regarded as full consonants and not as vowel letters. In most editions of the text it is confined solely to the consonantal נ at the end of words (since נ can never be a vowel letter in the middle of a word), e. g. גָּבְהָהּ (to be high), אֶרְצָהּ 'arṣāh (her land) which has a consonantal ending (shortened from -hā), different from אֶרְצָהּ 'arṣā (to the earth) which has a vowel ending.

Rem. 1. Without doubt such a *Hē* was distinctly aspirated like the Arabic *Hā* *b* at the end of a syllable. There are however examples where the consonantal character of this נ is lost (the *Mappiq* of course disappearing too), so that it has only the significance of a vowel letter; comp. § 91. 1, Rem. 2 on the 3rd fem. sing.

The name פִּינָק signifies *proferens*, i. e. a sign which distinctly brings out *c* the sound of the vowel letter as a consonant. The same sign was selected for this and for *Dageš*, since both are intended to indicate a hard, i. e. a strong, sound. Hence *Rāphè* (see No. 2) is the opposite of both.

2. In MSS. *Mappiq* is also found with מ, נ, ו, to mark them as consonants, *d* e. g. גָּבְהָהּ (gōy), גָּבְהָהּ (gāw). Comp. for the various statements of the Masora (where these points are treated as *Dageš*), Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, letter מ, § 5, and 'The Dageshed Alephs in the Karlsruhe MS.' (where these points are extremely frequent), in *Die Verhandlungen des Berliner Orientalisten-Kongresses*, Berlin, 1882, i. p. 136 sqq. The great differences in the statements found in the Masora point to a difference of the schools on this subject; one school appears to have intended that every audible מ should be pointed. In the printed editions the point occurs only four times with מ (מ or מ), Gen. 43, 26. Lev. 23, 17. Ezr. 8, 18 and Job 33, 21 (מ); where the point can be taken only as an orthophonetic sign, not with König as *Dageš forte*)¹.

Comp. Delitzsch, *Hiob.*, 2nd ed. p. 439 sqq.

2. *Rāphè* (רָפֶה i. e. soft), a horizontal stroke over the letter, is the *e* opposite of both *Dageš* and *Mappiq*, but especially of *Dageš lene*. In exact manuscripts every בְּנִדְכָּהּ letter has either *Dageš lene* or *Rāphè*, e. g. מֶלֶךְ mēlēkh, מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ. In the more modern editions of the text, *Rāphè* is used only when the absence of a *Dageš* or *Mappiq* is to be expressly pointed out.

[¹ The Masora takes the point to be *Dageš* in these four cases.—G. W. C.]

§ 15. *The Accents.*

a Cf. generally: A. Büchler, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehung u. Entwicklung d. hebr. Accente*, I. 'Die Ursprünge der vertikalen Bestandteile,' &c., Vienna, 1891; (cf. also *Theolog. Lit. Zeitung*, 1893, no. 17). Of later works on the ordinary accents (see below, 3 *a*), W. Heidenheim, *משפטי העצמים* [*The Laws of the Accents*], Rödelheim, 1808 (A compilation from older Jewish writing on the accents, with a commentary); W. Wickes (see also below), *מעמי כ"א ספרים* [*The Accents of the Twenty-one Books*], Oxford, 1887, an exhaustive investigation in English; A. Davis, London, 1892; S. P. Nathan, Hamb. 1893. The enumeration given below, follows Delitzsch's summary in Curtiss' English translation of Bickell's *Grundriss*, Lpz. 1877, pp. 18–21, with some modifications suggested by Wickes. On the accents of the Books *תנ"ך* (see below, 3 *b*), S. Baer, *תורת אמת* [*Accental Laws of the Books*], Rödelheim, 1852, and his addendum to Delitzsch's *Psalmcommentar*, Lpz. 1860, vol. ii, and in the 5th ed., 1894 (an epitome of this is to be found in Baer-Delitzsch's *Liber Psalmorum hebr.*, Lpz. 1861, 1874, 1880); comp. also Delitzsch's most instructive 'Accentuologischer Commentar' to Psalms 1–3, in his *Psalmcommentar* of 1874, as well as the numerous contributions to the critical accentuology of the text, &c., in the editions of the text by Baer and Delitzsch, and in the commentaries of the latter; W. Wickes, *מעמי אש"ף*, Oxford, 1881; Mitchell, in the *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1891, p. 144 sqq.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, p. 17 sqq.

- b* 1. The design of the accents is primarily to regulate most minutely the musical enunciation (chanting) of the Sacred Text, and thus they are first of all a kind of musical notes¹. Their value as such has, however, with the exception of a few traces, become lost in transmission. On the other hand, according to their original design they have also a twofold use which is still of the greatest importance for the grammar (and syntax), viz. their value (*a*) as marking the tone, (*b*) as marks of punctuation to point out the logical (syntactical) relation of single words to their immediate surroundings, and thus to the whole sentence².
- c* 2. As a mark of the tone the accent stands almost invariably with that syllable which has the principal tone in the word. This

¹ On the attempts of Christian scholars of the sixteenth century to express the Hebrew accents by musical notes, cf. Ortenberg, *ZDMG*. 1889, p. 534.

² At the same time however it must not be forgotten that the value of the accent as a mark of punctuation is always relative; thus, e. g. 'Athnah as regards the logical structure of the sentence may at one time indicate a very strong caesura (thus Gen. 1, 4); at another, one which is almost imperceptible (thus Gen. 1, 1).

is mostly the ultima, less frequently the penultima. Amongst the Jewish grammarians a word which has the tone on the ultima is called *Milra'* (Aram. מִלְרָא i.e. accented below), e.g. גָּאֻל qāṭāl; a word which has the tone on the penultima, *Milēl* (Aram. מִלְעֵל, accented above), e.g. מִלְעֵל mēlēkh. Moreover, in many cases a secondary tone is indicated in the word by Mēthēg (comp. § 16). Examples such as יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל Is. 50, 8 (comp. 40, 18. Ex. 15, 8. Lam. 2, 16) are regarded by the Jewish grammarians as even *proparoxytone*¹.

3. As marks of punctuation the accents are subdivided into *d* those which separate (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*) and those which connect (*Conjunctivi* or *Servi*). There is further to be distinguished a twofold system of accentuation: (a) that which is common in twenty-one Books (the כ"א i.e. twenty-one), and (b) the system of accents in the first three Books of the Hagiographa, Psalms, Proverbs and Job (*vox memor.* מִזְמֹרֹת, from the initial consonants of the names, תְּהִלֹת Psalms, מִשְׁלֵי Proverbs, אִיּוֹב Job, or more correctly, according to their sequence, וְהָאֵם; thus וְהָאֵם מִזְמֹרֹת signifies the accents [sing. מִזְמֹר] of the three mentioned Books). The latter system is not only richer and more complicated in itself, but also musically more significant than the ordinary accentuation.

I. The Common Accents.

Preliminary remark. The accents which are marked as *prepositive* stand *e* to the right over or under the initial consonant of the word; those marked as *postpositive* to the left over or under the last consonant. Consequently in both cases the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent (comp. however below, Rem. 2).

A. DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Distinctivi* or *Domini*)². *f*

1. (־) Silluq (end) always with the tone-syllable of the last word before (:) sôph pāsûq or verse-divider, e.g. : הָאֵם.

¹ Comp. Delitzsch on Is. 40, 18.

² The earlier Jewish accentuologists already distinguish between מִלְכִּים *Reges* and מִשְׁרֵתִים *Servi*. The division of the disjunctive accents into Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, which has become common amongst Christian grammarians, originated from the *Scrutinium S. S. ex accentibus* of Sam. Bohlius, Rost. 1636, and, as the source of manifold confusion, had better be given up. The order in which the accents are arranged in respect to their power as disjunctives, follows in general from the above classification revised according to Wickes. In respect to the height of tone (in chanting) 1, 2, 5, 4, 8, which were *low* and long sustained

58 *The Individual Sounds and Characters.* [§ 15.]

2. (—) 'Aṭhnāḥ or 'Athnaḥṭā (*rest*), the principal divider in the middle of the verse.
- 3 a. (—) Səgōltā, *postpositive*, marks the fourth or fifth subordinate division, counting backwards from the 'Aṭhnāḥ (e.g. Gen. 1, 7. 28).
- 3 b. (| —) Šalsēleth (i.e. *chain*), as disjunctive, as Great Šalsēleth, distinguished by the following Pāsēq¹-stroke from the conjunctive in the poetic accentuation, is used for Səgōltā (*seven times altogether*) when this would stand at the head of the sentence; comp. Gen. 19, 16 and elsewhere.
- 4 a. (—) Zāqēph gādōl, and
- 4 b. (—) Zāqēph qāṭōn. The names refer to their musical character. As a disjunctive, Little Zāqēph is stronger than Great Zāqēph; but if they stand together, the one which comes first is always the stronger.
5. (—) Tiphḥā or Ṭarḥā, a subordinate disjunctive before Sillūq and 'Aṭhnāḥ, but very often the principal disjunctive of the whole verse instead of 'Aṭhnāḥ; always so when the verse consists of only two or three words (e.g. Is. 2, 18); also however in longer verses (Gen. 3, 21).
6. (—) Rəbhīā'.
7. (—) Zarqā, *postpositive*.
- 8 a. (—) Pašā, *postpositive*², and

notes, are to be distinguished from the *high* notes (7, 3^a, 6, 13, 9), and the highest (3^b, 11, 12, 10); comp. Wickes, נ"ו 'ד p. 12 sqq.

¹ Pāsēq (i.e. the 'restrainer,' also incorrectly called Pəstq) nowhere appears as an independent but only as a constituent part of certain accents (comp. below, No. 13 and II. 11 a, b). Moreover Pāsēq is very frequently used as a mark for various purposes (see the Masoretic lists at the end of Baer's editions, and Wickes, *Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 120 sqq., where Pāsēq is divided into *distinctivum*, *emphaticum*, *homonymicum*, and *euphonicum*). The conjecture of Olshausen (*Lehrb.*, p. 86 sq.), that Pāsēq and other accents also served to point out marginal glosses subsequently interpolated, has been further developed by E. v. Ortenberg, 'Die Bedeutung des Pāsēq für Quellenscheidung in den BB. d. A. T.,' in *Progr. des Domgymn. zu Verden*, 1887, as well as in the article, 'Pāsēq u. Legarmeh,' in the *ZAW.* 1887, p. 301 sqq. (on the other hand, Wickes, *ibid.* 1888, p. 149 sqq.). See also E. König, in the *Zischr. f. kirchl. Wiss. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1889, parts 5 and 6; Maas, in *Hebraica*, v. 121 sqq., viii. 89 sqq.

² If the word in question has the tone on the penultima, Pašā is placed also over it, e.g. פִּתְּחָה Gen. 1, 2; comp. here Rem. 2 below.

- 8b. (ֿ) Yethîbh, *prepositive*, and thus different from Mēhuppākh. Yethîbh is used in place of Pašā when the latter would stand on a monosyllable or on a foretoned word, not preceded by a conjunctive accent.
9. (ֿ) Tēbhîr.
- 10a. (ֿ) Gēreš or Tēreš, in conjunction with Qadmā (see below) also called 'Azlā, and
- 10b. (ֿ) Gērāšayim¹ or Double Gēreš, used for Gēreš, when the tone rests on the uluma, and 'Azlā does not precede.
- 11a. (ֿ) Pāzēr, and
- 11b. (ֿ) Pāzēr gādōl (Great Pāzēr) or Qarnē phārā (*cow-horns*) only used in sixteen places, always to express special emphasis.
12. (ֿ) Tēlīšā gedōlā or Great Tēlīšā, *prepositive*.
13. (ֿ) Legarmēh, i.e. Mūnāh (see below) with a following Pāsēq.

B. CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS (*Conjunctivi* or *Servi*).

g

14. (ֿ) Mūnāh.
15. (ֿ) Mēhuppākh or Mahpākh.
- 16a. (ֿ) Mērekhā, and
- 16b. (ֿ) Mērekhā kēphūlā or Double Mērekhā.
17. (ֿ) Dargā.
18. (ֿ) 'Azlā, when associated with Gēreš (see above) also called Qadmā.
19. (ֿ) Tēlīšā qetannā or Little Tēlīšā, *postpositive*.
20. (ֿ) Galgal or Yērah.
- [21. (ֿ) Māyēlā, a variety of Tiphḥa, serves to mark the secondary tone in words which have Sillūq or 'Athnāh, or which are united by Maqqēph with a word so accentuated, e.g. מִן־אֶת־יְהוָה].

II. The Accents of the Books מ'תא.

A. DISTINCTIVI.

h

1. (ֿ) Sillūq (see above).
2. (ֿ) 'Ōlè weyōrēd², a stronger divider than

¹ Wickes requires Geršayim (גֵּרְשָׁיִם).

² Wrongly called also Mērekhā mēhuppākh (*Mēr'kha mahpakhatum*), although the accent underneath is in no way connected with Mērekhā; comp. Wickes as above, p. 14.

60 *The Individual Sounds and Characters.* [§ 15.]

3. (—) 'Athnāḥ (see above). In shorter verses 'Athnāḥ suffices as principal distinctive; in longer verses 'Ôl wəyōrēd serves as such, and is then mostly followed by 'Athnāḥ as the principal disjunctive of the second half of the verse.
4. (—) Rēbhîa' gādōl (Great Rēbhîa').
5. (—) Rēbhîa' mugrāš, i.e. Rēbhîa' with Gèrēš on the same word.
6. (—) Great Šālšēleth (see above, I. 3 ḏ).
7. (—) Šinnôr (Zarqā), as *postpositive*, is easily distinguished from Šinnôrîth similarly placed, which is not an independent accent, but stands only over an open syllable before a consonant which has Mērekhā or Mahpākh.
8. (—) Rēbhîa' qātôn (Little Rēbhîa') immediately before 'Ôl wəyōrēd.
9. (—) Deḥî or Ṭiphhā, *prepositive*, to the right underneath the initial consonant, e.g. 'āṭ (consequently it does not mark the tone-syllable).
10. (—) Pāzēr (see above).
- 11 a. (—) Mēhuppākh ləgarmēh, i.e. Mahpākh with Pāsēq.
- 11 b. (—) 'Azlā ləgarmēh, i.e. 'Azlā with Pāsēq.

i

B. CONJUNCTIVI.

12. (—) Mērekhā (see above).
13. (—) Mûnāḥ (see above).
14. (—) 'Illûy or Mûnāḥ superior.
15. (—) Ṭarḥā (under the tone-syllable, and thus easily distinguished from No. 9).
16. (—) Galgal or Yèraḥ (see above).
17. (—) Mēhuppākh or Mahpākh (see above).
18. (—) 'Azlā (see above).
19. (—) Šālšēleth qetannā (Little Šālšēleth).

The last three are distinguished from the disjunctives of the same name by the absence of the Pāsēq.

- [20. (—) Šinnôrîth, see above under No. 7.]

REMARKS ON THE ACCENTS.

I. *As Signs of the Tone.*

- k 1. As in Greek and English (comp. *elmi* and *elmu*, *compact* and *chcompact*) so also in Hebrew, words which are written with the same consonants are occasionally

distinguished by the position of the tone, e.g. בָּנוּ *banû* (they built), בָּנוּ *bdnu* (in us); גָּמָה *gama* (she stood up), גָּמָה *gamâ* (standing up, fem.).

2. As a rule the accent stands on the tone-syllable, and properly on its initial consonant. In the case of prepositives and postpositives alone the tone-syllable must be ascertained independently of the accent. In many MSS. as well as in Baer's editions of the text, the postpositive sign in foretoned words stands also over the tone-syllable after the analogy of *Pašjâ* (see above, I. 8 a, note); e.g. מִן־לֶחֶם Gen. 19, 4; so the prepositive sign in cases like יְהִי Gen. 8, 13.

II. As Signs of Punctuation.

3. In respect to this use of the accents, every verse is regarded as a period ^m which closes with *Sillûq*, or in the figurative language of the grammarians, as a province (*dilio*) which is governed by the great distinctive at the end. According as the verse is long or short, i.e. the province great or small, there are several subordinate *Domini* of different grades, as governors of greater and smaller divisions. When possible, the subdivisions themselves are also split up into parts according to the law of dichotomy (see Wickes, *The Accents of the Twenty-one Books*, p. 29 sqq.). When two or more equivalent accents (*Zâqêph*, *Rôbhfa*) occur consecutively, the accent which precedes causes a greater division than the one which follows; comp. e.g. the *Zâqêph*, Gen. 1, 20 a.

4. In general a conjunctive (*Servus*) unites only such words as are closely ⁿ connected in sense, e.g. a noun with a following genitive or a noun with an adjective. For the closest connexion between two or more words *Maqqêph* is added (§ 16. 1).

5. The consecution of the several accents (especially the correspondence of disjunctives with their proper conjunctives) conforms in the most minute details to strict ^o rules, for a further investigation of which we must refer to the above-mentioned works. Here, to avoid misunderstanding, we shall only notice further the rule that in the accentuation of Books מִן־לֶחֶם, the *Rôbhfa* *mugrâš* before *Sillûq*, and the *Dôh* before *Athnâh*, must be changed into conjunctives, unless at least two toneless syllables precede the principal disjunctive. For this purpose *Sôwâ mobile* after *Qameš*, *Sere*, or *Holem* (with *Metheg*) is to be regarded as forming a syllable. After 'Ôlê *wyôrêd* the *Athnâh* does not necessarily act as pausal (comp. Delitzsch on Ps. 45, 6). In the corrupt condition of our common texts, the system of accents can only be studied with the help of such correct editions as those of Baer.

6. A double accentuation occurs in Gen. 35, 22, from וַיִּשְׁכַּב onward ^p (where the later accentuation aims at uniting verses 22 and 23 into one); and in the Decalogue, Ex. 20, 2 sqq.; Deut. 5, 6 sqq. The later accentuation which closes the first verse with עֲבַדִּים (instead of פָּנִי) is adopted here also simply for the purposes of public reading, in order to reduce the original twelve verses to ten, the number of the Commandments; Geiger, *Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 373.

§ 16. *Of Maqqēph and Mèthēg.*

a These are both closely connected with the accents.

1. Maqqēph (מקף i.e. *binder*) is a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words which so connects them that in respect of tone and pointing they are to be regarded as one, and therefore have only one accent. Two, three, or even four words may be connected in this way, e.g. כָּל־אָדָם *every man*, אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב *every herb*, Gen. 1, 29, אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לִי *all that he had*, Gen. 25, 5.

b Certain monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions, such as אֶל *to*, עַד *until*, עַל *upon*, עִם *with*, אֶל־ *ne*, אִם *if, whether*, מִן *from*, כִּי *lest*, are almost always found with a following Maqqēph, provided they have not become independent forms by being combined with prefixes, e.g. מֵעַם, מִמָּלְכָם, in which case Maqqēph as a rule does not follow. Occasionally Maqqēph is replaced by a conjunctive accent (see above, § 9. 12, Rem. 1. *c*), as, according to the Masora, in Deut. 27, 9. 2 Sam. 20, 23. Jer. 25, 30. 29, 25. Eccl. 9, 4 in the case of כָּל־; Ps. 47, 5. 60, 2. Prov. 3, 12 in the case of אֶת־ the objective particle. Longer words are however connected by Maqqēph with a following monosyllable, e.g. הַתְּהִלָּה־נָּח Gen. 6, 9. וְיִהְיֶה־כֵּן Gen. 1, 7, also two words of more than one syllable, e.g. שִׁבְעָה־עָשָׂר *seventeen*, Gen. 7, 11. Comp. the Greek proclitics *εἰ, ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐκ, ἐκ*, which as *ἀνιστά* lean on the following word.

c 2. Mèthēg (מֶתֶג i.e. *a bridle*), a small perpendicular stroke under the consonant to the left of the vowel, indicates most frequently the secondary stress or counter-tone, as opposed to the principal tone marked by the accents. It serves however in other cases to point out that the vowel should not be hastily passed over in pronunciation, but should be allowed its full sound. Hence the other names of *Mèthēg*, *Mā'rikh*, i.e. *lengthener*, or *Gā'yā*, i.e. *raising of the voice*; and even *Greal Gā'yā* with long vowels, elsewhere *Little Gā'yā*¹.

d Further it is to be distinguished into: 1. The *light Mèthēg*. This is divided again into (*a*) the ordinary Mèthēg of the counter-tone, as a rule on the second (open) syllable before the tone, e.g. הַאֲדָמָה (comp. also such cases as וְיִהְיֶה־כֵּן); but also in the third when the second is closed, e.g. הַאֲרִבְעִים (also in such cases as

¹ Comp. as the source of this article on *Mèthēg*, the exhaustive statement by S. Baer upon the 'Mèthēg-Setzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen,' in A. Merx's *Archiv für die wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. Test.*, Halle, 1867, Heft i. p. 56 sqq., and 1868, Heft ii. p. 194 sqq.; Baer and Strack, *Dikduke ha-ʿamim*, p. 30 sqq.

עֲבֹד־הַפֶּלֶךְ, and when the third is not suitable for it, even on the fourth (open) syllable before the tone. This Mèthēg may be repeated in the fourth syllable before the tone, when it already stands in the second, e.g. שָׁבַע־תִּיכֶם. Finally it is always added to the vowel of an open ultima, which is joined by Maqqēph to a word beginning with a toneless syllable and so without Mèthēg (e.g. בְּנִי־שְׂרָאֵל, on the other hand רִשְׁפִּי־קֶשֶׁת, לֹא־אֲהִיָּהּ), or to a word beginning with an initial *Ṣwā* before the tone-syllable, e.g. מִלְכֶּךָ, שְׁלֹמֹה־בְּכִי, &c.; the object is to prevent the *Ṣwā* becoming *quiescent*.

The ordinary *light Mèthēg* never stands with a moveable *ṯ copulative*, consequently we do not find וּבְנִים, &c. (nor even וּבְנִי, &c., contrary to *b*, *a*; but וּבְנֶה, &c., according to *b*, *δ*, comp. § 10. 2, Rem.).

(*b*) The *firm or indispensable Mèthēg*. (*a*) With all long vowels (except in certain cases, *ṯ copulative*, see above), which are followed by a *Ṣwā mobile* preceding the tone-syllable, e.g. קָמְלָהּ, יִרְאֵי, יִשְׁנִי, &c. (*β*) To emphasize a long vowel immediately before Maqqēph, e.g. שְׁתַּלִּי Gen. 4, 25 (not *št-l*); hence also with פֶּלֶךְ Ps. 138, 2, and אֶת־ Job 41, 26 (for פֶּלֶךְ and אֶת־; cf. also מֵאֶת־ Jos. 15, 18 al.). (*γ*) With *Ṣere*, which has become toneless through retraction of the tone, in order to prevent its being pronounced as *Ṣēghōl*, e.g. אֶהָב־הָעֵץ Prov. 12, 1 (not *ʾēhāh*). (*δ*) With all vowels before composite *Ṣwā*, e.g. יִנְמֹד־וְצִקִּים, &c., except when the following consonant is doubled, e.g. יִקְבְּצֵנִי Is. 62, 2, because the sharpening by *Dageš* excludes the retarding of the vowel by *Mèthēg*; so in the cases discussed in § 28. 3, where instead of a *Ḥateph* a short vowel has arisen, as יַעֲמֹד־וְצִקִּים, &c. (*e*) In the initial syllable of all forms of הֵיךְ *to be*, and חָיָה *to live*, to emphasize more sharply the *Ṣwā quiescens* when it stands under the *Ḥ* or *Ḥ*, e.g. יִהְיֶה, חָיֶה (yih-yē, tih-yē), &c., comp. § 63, Rem. 5. (*ς*) With the *Qames of the plural* forms of בָּיִת *house* (thus בָּתִּים *bāttim*, comp. § 96 under בָּיִת), and with מִנְהָ *prithēl* to guard against the pronunciation *bāttim, ḥnnā*. Every kind of light Mèthēg may in certain circumstances be changed into a conjunctive accent, e.g. בָּתִּים 2 Chr. 34, 11, and elsewhere.

2. The *grave Mèthēg* (*Ga'yā* in the more limited sense) is especially employed in the following cases in order more distinctly to emphasize a short vowel or an initial *Ṣwā*: (*a*) with the *Pathah* of the article or of the prefixes ב, כ, ל, when followed by *Ṣwā* under a consonant without *Dageš*, e.g. הַמִּסְכָּה, הַמִּסְכָּה, &c., but not before י (before which י also remains without *Mèthēg*, with the exception of יִהְיֶה and יִחְיֶה, when they are followed by *Maqqēph*, or accented with *Pašā*), nor before the tone-syllable of a word, and neither before nor after the common *Mèthēg*; likewise not in words which are connected by a conjunctive accent with the following word; (*b*) with the interrogative ה with *Pathah* (except when it precedes י, *Dageš forte* or the tone-syllable of the word), e.g.

¹ The common form is מִנְהָ, or even with an accent on both syllables, in which case, according to Qimḥi, the tone is always to be placed on the former. For the above mode of writing and position of the tone comp. Is. 38, 3. Jon. 1, 14. 4, 2. Ps. 116, 4.

הַאֲ. When a *Šwā* follows the הַ and after the *Šwā* there is an untuned syllable, the *Mithēg* stands to the right of the *Pathah*, e.g. הַבְּרָכָה Gen. 27, 38. The *Šwā-Ga'yā* (וְ) is especially important in the accentuation of the Poetical Books, for purposes of musical recitation; it stands chiefly in words whose principal tone is marked by a disjunctive without a preceding conjunctive, e.g. הַיָּהּ Ps. 1, 3.

h 3. The *euphonic Ga'yā*, for the distinct pronunciation of those consonants which in consequence of the loss of the tone might easily be neglected, e.g. וְשָׁבַע לוֹ Gen. 24, 9; וְהָיָה לָהֶם (here to avoid an hiatus) 28, 2, or in such cases as וְהָיָה לָהֶם Job 33, 4, &c.

i *Mithēg* (especially in the cases mentioned in 1. δ, α) gives an indication of the correct pronunciation, since it distinguishes *ā* from *ǎ*, and *ē* from *ī*; e.g. אָכְלָה (*ā-khālā* (she has eaten)), but אֵכְלָה (*ǎkhālā* (food)), since the (־) stands here in a toneless closed syllable, and must therefore be a short vowel; thus also יִרְאוּ (they fear), but יִרְאוּ *yir'ā* (they see), יָשְׁנוּ (they slept), but יִשְׁנוּ (they repeat). The Jewish grammarians however do not consider the syllables lengthened by *Mithēg* as open. They regard the *Šwā* as *quiescent* in cases like אָכְלָה, and belonging to the preceding syllable (comp. Baer, *Thorat 'Emeth*, p. 9, and in Merx's *Archiv*, i. p. 60, Rem. 1, and especially *Dikduke ha-ḥamim*, p. 13); although, as König rightly maintains, the absence of *Dageš* in the consonant which follows *Šwā* (as e.g. בְּתִבָּה) is opposed to this.

§ 17. *Of the Qrē and K'ithbh.*

α 1. The margin of Biblical MSS. and editions exhibits various readings of an early date (§ 3. 2), called קְרִי *to be read*, since, according to the opinion of the Jewish critics, they are to be preferred to the כְּתִיב, i.e. what is *written* in the text, and are to be read instead of it.

On this account the vowels of the marginal reading (the *Qrē*) are placed under the consonants of the text, and in order to understand both readings properly, the vowels in the text must be attached to the marginal reading, while for the reading of the text (the *K'ithbh*) its own vowels are to be used. Thus in Jer. 42, 6 אָנֹכִי occurs in the text, in the margin קְרִי אָנֹכִי. Read אָנֹכִי *we* (or according to Jewish tradition אָנֹכִי) in the text, in the margin אָנֹכִי. A small circle or asterisk over a word in the text always refers to the marginal reading.

¹ On the necessity of the punctuation קְרִי (instead of קְרִי *Qrē*, formerly common, and used in earlier editions of this Grammar), comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*, p. 81, note.

2. Words or consonants which are to be passed over in reading, *b* and are therefore left unpointed, are called קְרִי וְלֹא קְרִיב (*scripta et non legenda*), e.g. אֵת Jer. 38, 16; אֵם 39, 12; יָדִיד 51, 3. Conversely, words not preserved in the text, but required by the Masora (as indicated by the insertion of their vowels), are called קְרִי וְלֹא קְרִיב, e.g. 2 Sam. 8, 3. Jer. 31, 38. See further Strack, *Prolegomena Critica*, p. 85; *Digduqe ha-t'amim*, §§ 62, 64; Blau, *Masoretische Untersuchungen*, p. 49 sqq.

3. In the case of some very common words, which are always to be read otherwise than according to the *K'thibh*, it has not been considered necessary to place the *Q'rê* in the margin, but its vowels are simply attached to the word in the text. The instances in which this *Q'rê perpetuum* occurs, are הוּא (Q. הוּא) in the Pentateuch wherever הוּא stands for the feminine (§ 32, Rem. 6); נָעַר (K'thibh נָעַר, Q'rê נָעָרָה) always in the Hebrew (*not* in the Samaritan) Pentateuch, except Deut. 22, 19. The ordinary explanation, on the analogy of Greek *ὁ παῖς* and *ἡ παῖς*, our *child*, is inadequate, since there is no trace elsewhere of this epicene use; cf. § 2. 5, Rem. Other instances are: יֶשְׁכָּר (Q. יֶשְׁכָּר) Gen. 30, 18 &c., comp. Ges. *Lexicon*, and Baer and Delitzsch, *Genesis*, p. 84, and below, note to § 47. 2; יְרוּשָׁלַם (Q. יְרוּשָׁלַם), properly יְרוּשָׁלַם; יְהוָה (Q. יְהוָה *the Lord*), or (after אֲדֹנָי) יְהוָה (Q. אֱלֹהִים), properly יְהוָה *Yahwê* (comp. § 102. 2, Rem.); perhaps also שְׁנִי, שְׁתִּי for שְׁנִי, שְׁתִּי, comp. § 97. 2.

CHAPTER II.

PECULIARITIES AND CHANGES OF LETTERS: THE
SYLLABLE AND THE TONE.

§ 18.

The changes which take place in the forms of the various parts of speech, depend partly on the peculiar nature of certain classes of letters and the manner in which they affect the formation of syllables, partly on certain laws of the language in regard to syllables and the tone.

§ 19. *Changes of Consonants.*

a The changes which take place among consonants, owing to the formation of words, inflexion, euphony, or to influences connected with the progress of the language, are *commutation, assimilation, rejection, addition, transposition, softening.*

1. *Commutation*¹ may take place between consonants which are either *homorganic* or *homogeneous* (comp. § 6. *g*), e. g. עָלַז, עָלַם, עָלַז to *exult*, לָאָה, לָהָה, Aram. לָעָא to *labour*, לָחַץ and נָחַץ to *press*, סָנַר and סָכַר to *close*, פָּלַם and פָּלַם to *escape*. In process of time, and partly under the influence of Aramaic, the *harder* and rougher sounds were changed into the softer, e. g. פָּחַץ into פָּחַץ to *laugh*, עָלַז into עָלַל to *reject*, and the *sibilants* into the corresponding mutes: ז into ר, ש into ת, צ into ט. In many cases these mutes may be regarded as a return to an earlier stage of the pronunciation.

¹ Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Forschungen*, Lpz. 1893, p. 15 sqq. ('Lautverschiebungen').

The interchange of consonants, however, belongs rather to the lexicographical treatment of roots¹ than to grammatical inflexion. To the latter belong (a) the interchange of ן and ׃ in *Hithpa'el* (§ 54. 2); (b) of י and ץ in verbs *primae Yôd* (§ 69), יָלַךְ for יָלַץ, &c.

2. *Assimilation* usually takes place when one consonant which closes a syllable passes over into another beginning the next syllable, and forms with it a double sound, as *illustris* for *inlustris*, *affero* for *adfero*, συλλαβάνω for συναλαμβάνω. In Hebrew this occurs,

(a) most frequently with ך, e.g. מִן־שָׁם (for *min-šām*) from there, מִן־זֶה (for *min-ze*) from this, יָנִיֵּן (for *yinēn*) he gives. ך is not assimilated after the prefix לְ, e.g. לִנְיָן, nor as a rule before gutturals (except sometimes before ה), nor when it is the third consonant of the stem, e.g. נָתַן־שָׁ (comp. however נָתַן־לְ for *nāthāntā*), except when another *Nun* follows, comp. § 44, Rem. 6; nor in some isolated cases, as Deut. 33, 9. Is. 29, 1. 58, 3, all in the principal pause; on הִנְיָן and הִנְיָן Ps. 68, 3, cf. § 51, Rem. 1, and § 66, Rem. 1.

(b) Less frequently and only in special cases with ל, ן, ך, e.g. יִלְקַח (for *yilqah*) he takes; יִתְנַחֵם for יִתְנַחֵם; אֶחָד for 'ahad.

(c) In isolated cases with ה, ו, י, e.g. אֶחָד *prithet* from אֶחָד; ו and י mostly before sibilants in the verbal forms enumerated in § 71.

In all these cases, instead of the assimilated letter, a *Dageš forte* *f* appears in the following consonant. *Dageš*, however, is omitted when the doubled consonant would stand at the end of the word, since the doubling would then be inaudible (§ 20. 3 a), e.g. אֶחָד *nose* (from 'anp), תִּתֵּן *to give* (from *tiŋt*).

The cases are less frequent where a following weaker sound is lost in pronunciation², and in place of it the stronger sound preceding is sharpened, i.e. takes *Dageš*, e.g. אֶחָד from אֶחָד (59, Rem. 3). אֶחָד for אֶחָד (56. 2) is an Aramaism.

3. *Complete rejection* takes place only in the case of weaker consonants, especially the liquids ך and ל, the aspirates א and ה, and the two half vowels י and ץ. Rejection takes place,

(a) at the beginning of a word (*aphaeresis*), when these weak consonants (א, י, ל, ך) are not supported by a full vowel, but have

¹ See in the *Lexicon*, the preliminary remarks on the several consonants.

² The German grammarians inaccurately call such a suppression of a sound 'Rückwärts-Assimilation.'

only Šewā, e.g. נָחַט *we*, also אֲנַחַט; וָדַע for וִדַע; לָשָׁח for לִשָּׁח; וָשָׁח for וִשָּׁח; נָחַי for נִחַי Ezek. 2, 10.

- i* Aphaeresis of a weak consonant with a full vowel perhaps occurs in רָד Jud. 19, 11 for וִרָד; in נִחַיָּה 2 Sam. 22, 41 for וִנַחַיָּה; in שָׁחַב for וִשָׁחַב Jer. 42, 10; on קָח Ezek. 17, 5 for וִקָח, and in קָחַם Hos. 11, 3 for וִקָחַם, see § 66, Rem. 2 ad fin. In reality, however, these forms are to be regarded rather as old textual errors.

- k* (b) In the middle of a word (syncope), when Šewā precedes the weak consonant¹; thus in the case of מ (see further § 23. 2, 3, and § 68, Rem. 1, 2), e.g. in מָיִם for מַיִם. As a rule in such cases, however, the מ is orthographically retained, e.g. לִקְרֹאת for לִקְרֹאת. Syncope occurs frequently in the case of ה, e.g. לִהְיוֹת for לִהְיוֹת (§ 23. 4 and § 35, Rem. 2), יִהְיוּ for יִהְיוּ (§ 53, 1).

Syncope of מ with Šewā occurs in such cases as בְּמִדְבָּר for בְּמִדְבָּר (comp. § 102. 2 *d*, Rem.)²; וְאֶשֶׁר Zech. 11, 5. On the cases where מ is wholly omitted after the article, see § 35. 2, 1 Rem.

Finally, the elision of ו and י in verbs לִ'ה (§ 75. 3) is an instance of syncope. On the syncope of ה between two vowels, comp. § 23. 4 *b*.

- l* (c) At the end of a word (apocope), e.g. גִּלְוָה pr. name of a city (comp. גִּלְוִי Gilonite), וְיָרָא, where מ really rejected is orthographically retained, &c. On the apocope of ו and י in verbs לִ'ה, see § 24. 2, Rem. and § 75.

Bolder changes, (especially the apocope of strong consonants,) were made in earlier periods of the language. For instance, especially the weakening of the feminine ending מִתּ to מִתְּ, see § 44. 1 and § 80. 1.

- m* 4. To avoid harshness in pronunciation a helping sound, Aleph prosthetic³ with its vowel, is prefixed to some words, e.g. אֶרֶץ and אֶרֶץ arm (comp. ἄρθῆς, ἑχθῆς; *spiritus*, French *esprit*).

- n* 5. Transposition⁴ seldom occurs in the grammar, e.g. הַשְׁמִימָה for

¹ Syncope of a strong consonant (ע) occurs in פִּי *prithes* if this stands for פְּעִי (see *Lexicon*), also in וְשָׁקַח Am. 8, 8, קִּיִּיתִי for וְשָׁקַח (comp. וְשָׁקַח 9, 5), and in בְּלִיָּה Jos. 19, 3 for וְשָׁקַח (as in 15, 29). Probably however וְשָׁקַח and בְּלִיָּה are only clerical errors, as is undoubtedly בָּאֵר Am. 8, 8 for בְּאֵר (9, 5).

² Frensdorff, *Ochla W'ochla*, p. 97 sq., gives a list of forty-eight words with quiescent מ.

³ This term is at any rate as suitable as the name *Aleph prostheticum* proposed by Nestle, *Marginalien u. Materialien* Tübingen, 1893, p. 67 sqq.

⁴ Cf. Barth, *Etymologische Studien*, Lpz. 1893, p. 1 sqq.; Königsberger, in *Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1894, p. 451 sqq.

הַשֵּׁשֶׁת (§ 54. 2) for the sake of euphony; it is more frequent in the lexicon (שֶׁשֶׁת and שֵׁשֶׁת *lamb*, שִׁטְלָה and שִׁטְלָה *garment*), but is mostly confined to sibilants and liquids.

6. Softening occurs e.g. in פֹּכֶב *star*, from *kaukabh* = *kawkabh* or for *kabhkabh* (comp. Syriac *raurab* = *rabrab*); כֹּפֶלֶת *phylacteries* for *taphiāphōth*; according to the common opinion, also in מִן *man* from *'inš*, comp. however § 96.

§ 20. The Doubling (strengthening and sharpening) of Consonants.

1. The doubling of a consonant, indicated by *Dageš forte*, takes a place, and is necessary and essential (*Dageš necessarium*)

(a) when the same consonant would be written twice in succession without an intermediate vowel or *šwā mobile*; thus we have נָחַם for נָחַם *nāḥan-nū* and שָׁרַף for שָׁרַף; "p...
Dageš

(b) in cases of assimilation (§ 19. 2), e.g. יָנִיעַ for *yiniēn*. In both these cases the *Dageš* is called *compensativum*;

(c) when it is characteristic of a grammatical form, e.g. לָמַד *he has learned*, לָמַד *he has taught* (*Dageš characteristicum*). In a wider sense this includes the cases in which a consonant is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, to preserve a preceding short vowel (which in an open syllable would have to be lengthened by § 26. 3), e.g. מַלְכִּים *camels* for *g'mālīm*; cf. § 93. 2, Rem. 1 and Rem. 2 ad fin.; § 93. 3, Rem. 1.

This coalescing of two consonants does not take place when the first has a vowel or *šwā mobile*. In the latter case, according to the correct Masora, it should be written with a *compound šwā* preceded by *Methēg*, e.g. הַלְלִים, הַלְלִים, &c. (comp. § 16). This pointing is not found before the suffix י, e.g. הַלְלִי Gen. 27, 4, although the first ל has a *vocal šwā*, otherwise the second ל would have *Dageš lene*. Also when the former of the two consonants has been already doubled by *Dageš forte*, since as it must have at least a *vocal šwā*, any further contraction is impossible. This applies also to cases where *Dageš forte* has been omitted (see below 3. d), e.g. הַלְלִי properly הַלְלִי = *hal-l'ā*. The form הַלְלִי Ps. 9, 14 (not הַלְלִי) might be explained as imperat. Pi'ēl = הַלְלִי; in the imperat. Qal the non-contraction of the monosyllabic root would be as strange as it is in הַלְלִי Jer. 49, 28, and in the imperf. הַלְלִי Jer. 5, 6.

2. A consonant is sometimes doubled merely for the sake of *euphony* (*Dageš euphonicum*), and the doubling is then not so essential. This occurs¹—

¹ Comp. Baer, 'De primarum vocabulorum literarum dagessatione,' in his

(a) when two words are closely united in pronunciation by *Dageš forte conjunctivum*: (1) in the first letter of a monosyllable or of a word having the tone on the first syllable¹, which is preceded by a word closely connected with it by *Maqqēph*, and ending in a tone-bearing ה־ with *Šwā mobile* preceding (except when ה־ is the ending of the 3rd masc. sing. perf. of a verb לִּי), or tone-bearing ה־, the דָּגֵשׁ (i.e. *compressed*) of the Jewish grammarians.

Some limit the use of the *Dhāq* to the closest union of a monosyllable with a following *B'gadk'phath*. However, it also applies to cases like לִכְהֹנָא Num. 22, 6; לִקְחֵהֲמָא Gen. 2, 23; יִצְחָקֶךָ Ps. 91, 11; and even in רֵאשִׁית מַעֲנֵהֶיךָ Prov. 15, 1; וְשִׁשְׁנֵהֶם Gen. 43, 15. In all these examples the tone, were it not for the *Maqqēph*, would be on the ultima of the first word.

d Rem. 1. When the short words הֵן *this*, and מָה (properly מַה) *what?* have *Maqqēph* after them, a *Dageš forte conj.* always follows, even if the next word is neither a monosyllable nor has the tone on the initial syllable; thus not only in וְהָיָה שְׂמוֹ Jer. 23, 6 (where שְׂמוֹ is counted as *one* syllable), but also in מִדְּפָרְצָה Gen. 38, 29, comp. 28, 17. 31, 36. 44, 16; וְהָיָה בְּרִיךְ Num. 13, 27. 1 Chr. 22, 1. In הִנֵּה נָא Gen. 19, 2 (where *Maqqēph* is represented by a conjunctive accent, § 9. 12, Rem. 1. c, and § 16. 1, Rem.), the *S'ghôl* belongs to the secondary-tone syllable.

e 2. Such cases as נִאֲמַר וְנִאֲמַר Ex. 15, 1. 21; וְנִאֲמַר ver. 11, and perhaps also וְנִאֲמַר ver. 13, וְנִאֲמַר ver. 16, do not belong here. In these the *Dageš* can only be intended for *Dag. lenē*, see § 21. 1, Rem. 2.

f (2) In the first letter of a monosyllable, or of a word with the tone on the first syllable after a closely connected *mil'el*, ending in ה־ or ה־. Such a *mil'el* is called by the Jewish grammarians *מִלְּעֵל וְנִינְיָא veniens e longinquo* (in respect of the tone). The attraction of the following tone-syllable by *Dageš forte conj.* is for the sake of rhythm, e.g. שְׁבִיתָ שְׁבִי Ps. 68, 19; הִרְחִיבָה שְׂאֵל Is. 5, 14; עֲשֵׂה פֶרִי Gen. 1, 11; אֲרֵצָה קְנֵנִי 11, 31; חֲשַׁבְתָּ לִּי 21, 23. The prefixes בְּ, כִּי, לְ and לְ alone do not take a *Dageš* in this case, except in לְךָ, which has always *Dageš*, and לְלֵילָה Ps. 19, 3. Such forms as מִלְּאָה Ps. 26, 10; וְהָיָה פִּנִּי Job 21, 16; and even גִּעְזָה יָחִיד Is. 50, 8,

Introduction to *Liber Proverbiorum*, Lpz. 1880, pp. vii-xv; F. Praetorius, 'Über den Ursprung des Dag. f. conjunctivum,' in *ZAW.* 1883, p. 17 sqq.

¹ לִּי alone, although having the tone on the ultima, invariably retains the *Dageš forte conj.* when מִלְּעֵל with a conjunctive accent precedes, Ex. 6, 10. 29. 15, 24, &c.

i. e. the cases where the accent of the ultima is thrown back on the syllable which otherwise would have *Metheg*, are likewise regarded as *mil'el*. On the other hand, e. g. לָךְ הָרָה Gen. 4, 6, not לָךְ since the first *ā* of הָרָה could not have *Metheg*. The Imperfects and Participles of verbs ל"ה are, however, exceptions. When words are closely united by *Maqqēph* the same rules apply as above, except that in the first word *Metheg*, as a secondary tone, appears instead of the accent, comp. עֲשֶׂהְךָ Gen. 1, 12; הַיְיָרָהָנָא Gen. 32, 30, and elsewhere. Finally, the *Dageš* is used when the attracted word does not begin with the principal accent, but with a syllable having *Metheg*, הַפֶּה יִירָשׁ Ps. 37, 9; אֵלֶּה יַעֲקֹב Is. 44, 21; עֲשִׂיתָ פְעֻלָּתִי Ex. 25, 29, provided that the second word does not begin with a *B'gadk'phath* letter (comp. e. g. אֵלֶּה הַתְּלֹרוֹת Gen. 2, 4).

Rem. Such cases as בָּנָךְ Deut. 32, 6, and בְּשִׁיתָ 32, 15, and נָעוּת (so *g* Baer, but not ed. Mant., &c.) 1 Sam. 1, 13 are therefore anomalous; also, because beginning with a *B'gadk'phath*, בְּאֵלֶם Ex. 15, 11 (comp. however above, Rem. 2); תָּלַ- Jos. 8, 28; בְּרָדָע Ps. 77, 16; בְּנֵיהִיא Job 5, 27. It is doubtful whether we should include here those cases in which *Dageš forte* occurs after a word ending in a toneless *ā*, such as קִישׁ צָאֵי Gen. 19, 14; comp. Ex. 12, 31; Ex. 12, 15 (שָׂאֵר). Deut. 2, 24; also לֹא Gen. 19, 2. 1 Sam. 8, 19; לֹא Judg. 18, 19. Esth. 6, 13; מִעֵט Hos. 8, 10; בָּרַד Jer. 49, 30; רָדָד 1 Sam. 15, 6. When we explained the *Dageš* in these examples not as conjunctive, but orthophonic (see above, § 13. 2, Rem., and Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 4th ed. on Ps. 94, 12 *a*), we especially referred to those cases in which the consonant with *Dageš* has a *Šwā*. The extension of the use of *Dageš* to consonants with a strong vowel, seems however to indicate that these are cases of the מְרַחֵק, which was required by some Masoretes but not consistently inserted. On the other hand, the *Dageš forte* in ' after a preceding *t* (Ps. 118, 5. 18), and even after *ā* (Ps. 94, 12), is to be explained as an attempt to preserve its consonantal power by sharpening; see König, *Lehrgeb.* p. 54, *b*.

(*δ*) When a consonant with *Šwā* is sharpened by *Dageš forte* *h* *dirimens* to make the *Šwā* more audible. In almost all cases the sharpening can be easily explained from the character of the consonant itself, which is almost always a Liquid, Sibilant or the emphatic *Qōph*; comp. עֲנִי Lev. 25, 5. Deut. 32, 32 (for עֲנִי); פְּנִילָה Is. 33, 1 (where, however, פְּנִילָה is to be read); comp. Nah. 3, 17. Job 9, 18. 17, 2. Joel 1, 17 (with *ם*); Is. 57, 6 (with *ל*); Judg. 20, 43¹. 1 Sam. 1, 6 (with *ר*); Gen. 49, 10. 17 (and so always in עֲנִי Judg. 5, 22. Song 1, 8

¹ The ordinary reading הַיְיָרָהָנָא, where *ר* is without *Dageš*, assumes the *ר* to have *Dageš*.

and עֲקִבּוֹת Ps. 77, 20. 89, 52; Ex. 15, 17. Deut. 23, 11. Judg. 20, 32. 1 Sam. 28, 10 (p); Ex. 2, 3. Is. 58, 3. Am. 5, 21. Ps. 141, 3. Prov. 4, 13. 15, 13 (צ); Prov. 27, 25 (ש); Is. 5, 28. Ps. 37, 15. Jer. 51, 56. Neh. 4, 7 (ש). Moreover, with כ Hos. 3, 2; with ב Is. 9, 3. Jer. 4, 7; with ת 1 Sam. 10, 11. In many instances of this kind the influence of the following consonant is also observable.

i (c) When a vowel is to be made more emphatic, especially in the principal *pause*, by a *Dageš forte affectuosum* in the following consonant. Thus in a following Liquid, Judg. 5, 7 (חֲרָלִי); Job 29, 21 (וְחָרָלִי); 22, 12 (רָמָה); Ezek. 27, 19 (in נ); in ת Is. 33, 12. 41, 17. Jer. 51, 58, perhaps also Job 21, 13 (יִחָרָה).

k (d) When a Liquid is doubled by *Dageš forte firmativum* in the pronouns הִפְּחָה, הִנֵּנָה, הִלֵּלָה, and in לִפְּחָה *why?* cf. also בִּפְּחָה, בִּפְּחָה *whereby?* בִּפְּחָה *how much?* (§ 102. 2 d), to give greater firmness to the preceding tone-vowel.

l 3. Omission of the doubling, or at least the loss of the *Dageš forte* occurs,

(a) *almost always* at the end of a word, since here a double consonant cannot easily be pronounced¹. In such cases the preceding vowel is frequently lengthened (§ 27. 2 δ), e.g. רֹב *multitude*, from רֹבֵב; עָם *people*, with a distinctive accent and after the article עַם, from עָמָם; but e.g. גַּן *garden*, בַּת *daughter*, with the final consonant sharpened. On the exceptions אַתָּה *thou* (fem.) and הִנָּתָה *thou hast given* Ezek. 16, 33, comp. § 10. 3, Rem.

m (δ) Very frequently in certain consonants with *ſtud mobile*, since the absence of a strong vowel causes the doubling to be less audible. This occurs principally in the case of ו and י (on ו and י after the article, see § 35. 1, Rem.; on י after פִּי, § 37. 1, Rem.), and in the liquids מ², נ and ל, less frequently in the sibilants, and this chiefly when a guttural follows; (comp., however, Is. 62, 2, מְאֻסָּיו, as ed. Mant. correctly reads, while Baer has מְאֻסִּי with compensatory

¹ So in Latin *fel* (for *fell*), gen. *fellis*; *mel*, *mellis*; *os*, *ossis*. In Middle High German the doubling of consonants never takes place at the end of a word, but only in the middle (as in the Old High German), e.g. *val* (*Fall*), gen. *valles*; *swam* (*Schwamm*), &c., Grimm, *Deutsche Gramm.*, and ed., i. 383.

² *Dageš forte* is almost always omitted in ו when it is the prefix of the participle, hence Ps. 104, 3 הַיָּסֵרָה *who layeth the beams*, but הַיָּסֵרָה *the roof* Eccles. 10, 18 (comp. הַיָּסֵרָה *the work*, &c.).

lengthening, and others even מַסְמִי; Gen. 27, 28. 39; 38, 24 מַסְמִי for מַסְמִי, Ki. 7, 28; מַסְמִי Ki. 19, 20 from מַסְמִי, Ezek. 40, 43 and מַסְמִי Ps. 104, 18; מַסְמִי Jon. 4, 11, Ex. 8, 1 and elsewhere), and finally in the emphatic p¹.

Of the *B'gadk'phath* letters, ב occurs without *Dageš* in מַבְצִיר Judg. 8, 2, ב in מַבְצִיר Ezek. 32, 30, ב in נְדָחִי (Is. 11, 12. 56, 8. Ps. 147, 2; not in Jer. 49, 36), supposing that it is the Participle Niph'al of נָדַח; lastly, ח in חַרְצָה Is. 22, 10. Comp. moreover, הַיָּחִיד and חַרְצָה, the *constr. st.* of הַיָּחִיד and חַרְצָה, also שְׂנִינֹת the *constr. st. plur.* of שָׁנָה.—Examples, עָוִיר, עָוִיר (so always the preformative י in the imperf. of verbs), מַלְאֵךְ, מַלְאֵךְ, מַלְאֵךְ, &c. In correct MSS. the omission of the *Dageš* is indicated by the *Rāphē* stroke (§ 14) over the consonant. Moreover, the preceding short vowel, which would be lengthened in an open syllable, indicates that at least a *virtual* doubling takes place by means of a *Dageš forte implūctum* (see § 22. 1, Rem.).

(c) In the Gutturals, see § 22. 2.

Rem. 1. Contrary to rule the doubling is omitted (especially in the later Books), owing to the lengthening of the preceding short vowel, which is mostly *hireq* (comp. *mīle* for *mille*), e.g. יִחַיְתָן *he makes them afraid*, for יִחַיְתָן (Hab. 2, 17, where perhaps however it is more correct to suppose with König, a formation after the analogy of verbs יָצַע, and moreover to read יִחַיְתָן with the LXX), יִקָּח Is. 50, 11 for יִקָּח.

2. Very doubtful are the instances in which compensation for the doubling *o* is supposed to be made by the insertion of a following נ. Thus for מַעֲנִיָּה Is. 23, 11, מַעֲנִיָּה (or מַעֲנִיָּה) is to be read; and for תַּמְנִי Lam. 3, 22, תַּמְנִי is the correct reading. קָבַע Num. 23, 13 is not an instance of compensation (see § 67, Rem. 2 at the end).

§ 21. The Aspiration of the Tenuēs².

The *harder* sound of the six *B'gadk'phath* letters, indicated by a *Dageš lene*, is to be regarded, according to the general analogy of languages, as their older and original pronunciation, from which the softer sound was weakened (§ 6. 3 and § 13). The original hard

¹ According to some also in ב in מַסְמִי Is. 17, 10; but see Baer on this passage.

² Comp. Delitzsch, *Ztschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1878, p. 585 sqq.

pronunciation is maintained when the letter is initial, and after a consonant, but when it immediately follows a vowel or *Šwā mobile* it is softened and aspirated by their influence, e. g. פָּרָץ *pāras*, יִפְרֹץ *yiphrōs*, כֹּל *kōl*, לָל *lāl*, פְּחֹל *Phhōl*. Hence the *Bḡadk'phath* take *Dageš lene*,

- b* (1) at the beginning of words: (a) without exception when the preceding word ends with a vowelless consonant, e. g. אֶל-כֵּן *al-kēn* (therefore), עֵץ פֵּרִי *ēṣ p'ri* (fruit-tree); (b) at the beginning of a chapter, e. g. בְּרֵאשִׁית Gen. 1, 1, and at the beginning of a sentence, or even of a minor division of a sentence after a distinctive accent (§ 15. 3), although the preceding word may end with a vowel. The distinctive accent in such a case prevents the vowel having an influence on the following tenuis, e. g. וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר *and it was so, that* when, Judg. 11, 5 (on the other hand וַיְהִי־כֵן Gen. 1, 7).

- c* Rem. 1. The vowel letters ה, י, ו, א, as such, naturally do not close a syllable. In close connexion they are therefore followed by the aspirated *Bḡadk'phath*, e. g. וּבְנָמָה בָּהּ, &c. On the other hand, syllables are closed by the consonantal ו and י (exceptions קָרְתָּו Is. 34, 11; שָׁלוֹן בָּהּ Ezek. 23, 42; and בָּמִי אֶרְוִי Ps. 68, 18), as well as by מ with *Mapplq*, hence e. g. there is *Dageš lene* in עָלַי בִּיהֶם and always after וַיְהִי, since the *Qere perpetuum* of this word (§ 17) presupposes the reading אֶרְוִי.

- d* 2. In a number of cases *Dageš lene* is inserted, although a vowel precedes in close connexion. This almost always occurs in the prefixes ב and פ when in the combinations בֶּב, פֶּפ, פֶּפ (i. e. in the *Bḡadk'phath* with *Šwā* before the same or a kindred aspirate) and פֶּפ (see Baer, *L. Psalmorum*¹, 1880, p. 92, on Ps. 23, 3); comp. e. g. 1 Sam. 25, 1. Is. 10, 9. Ps. 34, 2. Job 19, 2; כֶּנ is uncertain; כֶּב, כֶּר, and כֶּב according to David Qimḥi should remain aspirated, also כֶּנ, כֶּב, and כֶּפ according to the *Dikduke ha-ḥ'amim*, p. 30. Sometimes the *Bḡadk'phath* letters, even with a full vowel, take *Dageš* before a spirant (and even before ה in בְּחִשְׁקָה 1 Ki. 12, 32). Here also belong the cases mentioned above, § 20. *c* (mostly *tenuis* before א). In all these cases the object evidently is to prevent too great an accumulation of aspirates. The LXX, on the other hand, almost always represent the כ and פ, even at the beginning of a syllable, by χ and φ; Χερσὸβ, Χαλδαίος, Φαράρ, &c. The forms פֶּכְרִי (after וַיְהִי) Is. 54, 12, and פֶּכְלִי (after וַיְהִי) Jer. 20, 9 are doubly anomalous.

- e* (2) In the middle of words after *Šwā quiescens*, i. e. at the beginning of a syllable immediately after a vowelless consonant²,

¹ Also *L. Proverbiorum*, 1880, Praef. p. ix; and *Dikduke ha-ḥ'amim*, p. 30 (in German in König's *Lehrgeb.* i. p. 62).

² וַיְהִי Jos. 15, 38 (see *Minḥat shay*, on this passage), 2 Ki. 14, 7, and וַיְהִי Jos. 15, 56 are inexplicable exceptions.

e. g. ירפא *yirpā* (*he heals*), יקטלכם *ye have killed*; on the other hand after *Šwā* mobile there is the soft pronunciation, e. g. רפא *rphā* (*heal thou*), כבדה *she was heavy*.

On קטלך, ירפך and similar forms, see § 10. 3.

Whether *Šwā* be vocal and consequently causes the aspiration of a following *tenuis*, depends upon the origin of the respective forms. It is almost always vocal,

(a) When it has arisen from the weakening of a strong vowel, e. g. רדפו *pursue ye* (not רדפו from רדף; מלכי (not מלכי), because it is properly *mālikhē* (but מלכי from the ground-form *malik*).

(b) With the ו of the pronominal suffixes of the 2nd pers. קָ, כָּ, לוֹ, since the *Šwā* mobile is characteristic of this form (see § 58. 3 b; § 91. 1).

Rem. Forms like שְׁלַחְתָּ *thou (fem.) hast sent*, in which we should expect *g* an aspirated ח after the vowel, were originally שְׁלַחְתָּ, &c.; Pathah being here simply a helping vowel has no influence on the *tenuis*; comp. § 28. 4.

§ 22. Peculiarities of the Gutturals.

The four gutturals ח, ה, ע, א, in consequence of their peculiar *a* pronunciation, have special characteristics, but א, as the weakest of these sounds, and sometimes also ע (which elsewhere as one of the harder gutturals is the opposite of א) differ in several respects from the stronger ח and ה.

1. They do not admit of *Dages forte*, since, in consequence of *b* a gradual weakening of the pronunciation (see below, note 1), the doubling of the aspirates was hardly audible to the Masoretes. But a distinction must be drawn here between (a) the complete omission of the doubling, and (b) the mere trace of the doubling, commonly called *half*, or better, *virtual* doubling.

In the former case, the short vowel before the guttural would stand *c* in an open syllable, and must accordingly be lengthened¹. But a distinction must be again drawn between the full lengthening of *Pathah* into *Qames*—mostly before א (always under the ח of the article, see § 35), as a rule also before ע, less frequently before ה, and least often before ח—and the half lengthening of *Pathah* into *Sghōl*, mostly before a guttural with *Qames*. In the other case (*virtual*

¹ Comp. *terra* and the French *terre*, the German *Rolle* and the French *rôle*; German *drollig* and French *drôle*. The omission of the doubling shows a deterioration of the language. The fresher and more original phonetic system of the Arabic (§ 1. 6) still admits everywhere of the doubling of the gutturals.

doubling) the *Dages* is omitted, but the doubling is regarded as having taken place, and therefore the preceding vowel remains short. This virtual doubling consequently occurs most frequently with ה, usually with ח, less frequently with ע, and very seldom with א. Examples of (a) מֵאֵן for *mi'en*; הָאָדָם for *ha'ādām*; יִהְיֶה (for *yihhābē*); further אָחֵךְ, הָחֵךְ, הָהָרִים, הָעֵנִי (see more fully on the pointing of the article before ע in § 35).—Of (b) מִיָּדָךְ, מִיָּדָי (from *minhdt*), הָרָא, הָרָא, בָּעַר, נָאֵץ, &c.—In all these cases of virtual doubling the *Dages forte* is to be regarded at least as implied (hence called *Dages forte implicitum*, *occultum*, or *delitescens*).

- d 2. They prefer before them, sometimes also after them, a short A-sound (comp. Rem. 1), because this vowel is organically the nearest akin to the guttural sounds¹.

Hence (a) before a guttural, *Pathah* readily takes the place of another short vowel as well as of a rhythmically long *ē* and *ō*, e.g. זָבַח *sacrifice*, not *zēbēh*; שָׁמַע *report*, not *šēmā*. This is more especially so, when *a* was the original vowel of the word, or is otherwise admissible. Thus in the Imper. and Imperf. Qal of guttural verbs, שְׁלַח *send thou*, יִשְׁלַח *he will send* (not *yislōh*); Perf. Piel שָׁלַח (not *šillēh*); יִחְמַד *he will desire* (not *yihmōd*); נָעַר *a youth*. In the last three cases *ā* is the original vowel.

- e Rem. That Soghōl remains before א in such cases as שָׁאֵן, שָׁנָא, שָׁלָא, שָׁרָא, is to be explained from the fact that א here has lost its consonantal value, and is only retained as a vowel letter (see § 23. 1).

- f (b) After a heterogeneous long vowel, i. e. after all except *Qames*, the hard gutturals (consequently not א) require, when standing at the end of the word, the insertion of a rapidly uttered *ā* (*Pathah furtive*) between themselves and the vowel. This *Pathah* is placed under the guttural, but sounded before it. It is, therefore, merely an orthographic indication not to neglect the guttural sound in pronunciation, e.g. רָחַץ *raḥ*, נָעַץ, רָעַץ, הִשְׁלִיךְ, גָּבוּהַ (when consonantal ה is final it necessarily takes Mappiq). But at the beginning of a syllable, e.g. הָרָא &c., since here the rapidly uttered *ā* is no longer heard.

¹ Like the gutturals, the A-sound is produced by opening the mouth and directly emitting a breath, while the vowels of the I-class are formed partly by the palate, and those of the U-class by the lips.

I^{ch} for *ich*, &c., are analogous instances amongst some of the Swiss¹; a *g* *Pathah furtive* is here involuntarily intruded before the deep guttural sound. In *Arabic* the same may be heard in such words as *mestah*, although it is not expressed in writing. The LXX (and Jerome, cf. *ZAW.* iv. 79) write *ε*, sometimes *α*, instead of *Pathah furtive*, e. g. נָח נֹחַ, נָח נֹחַ, Ἰεδδούα (also Ἰαδδούα).

Rem. 1. The guttural may also have an influence upon the following *h* vowel, especially in the Segholate forms, e. g. נָעַר (not *na'ēr*) a youth, פָּעַל (not *pō'el*) deed. The only exceptions are אָהֵל, בָּהֵן, לָחֵם, רָחֵם.

2. Where in the present form of the language *ḥ*, attenuated from *Pathah*, *i* would stand before or after a guttural in the first syllable of a word, a *S^ghōl* as being between *ḥ* and *l* is frequently used instead, e. g. יִחְבֹּשׁ (also יִחְבֹּשׁ), יִהְיֶה, חֲבָלִי, עֲמָדָה, נִאֲדָר, חֲבָלִי, &c.

On the other hand, the slighter and sharper *Hireq* is retained even under *h* gutturals when the syllable is sharpened by *Dageš forte*, e. g. הִפְלֵל, הִנֵּה, חֲפָה; but when this sharpening falls away, *S^ghōl* is apt to reappear, e. g. הִנֵּינִי constr. הִנֵּינִי.

3. Instead of simple *S^wd mobile*, the gutturals take without exception a compound *S^wd*, e. g. שָׁחַט, אָמַר, אָהֵלִים, &c.

4. When a guttural with quiescent *S^wd* happens to close a *m* syllable in the middle of a word, the strong closed syllable (with quiescent *S^wd*) can remain, especially with *ḥ* and *ṣ* at the end of the tone syllable, e. g. שָׁחַט, יִדְעָה, but also before the tone (see examples under No. 2, Rem. 2), and similarly with *h* and *ḥ*.

But in the syllable before the tone and further back, the closed syllable is generally opened artificially, by a *Hateph* taking the place of a quiescent *S^wd* (owing to the nature of the gutturals), and especially the *Hateph* which repeats the sound of the preceding vowel, e. g. חָשַׁב (also יִחְשַׁב); יָחֹק (also יִחֹק); פָּעַל (for פָּעֵל). But when, owing to a flexional change, the strong vowel following the *Hateph* is weakened into *S^wd mobile*, then instead of *Hateph* its vowel alone is written, e. g. יַעֲמֹד (from יַעֲמֹד), נַעֲרָב, פָּעֵל (from פָּעֵל). The original forms, according to § 28. 3, were *ya'm'dhā*, *ne'r'mā*, *ṭō'r'khā*. Hence יַעֲמֹד, &c., are really only different orthographic forms of יַעֲמֹד, &c., and would be better transcribed by *ya'm'dhā*, &c.

Rem. 1. The grammarians call simple *S^wd* under the gutturals *hard* (רָחֵם), *n* and the compound *S^wd* they call *soft* (רָחֵם). See further in the observations on verbs with gutturals, §§ 62-65.

[¹ Comp. also our use of a furtive *ε* before *r* after *ē*, *i*, *ū* and *ou*, e. g. *here* (pronounced *hē^rr*), *fire* (*fī^rr*), *pure* (*pū^rr*), and *our* (*ou^rr*).—G. W. C.]

o 2. Respecting the choice between the three compound *Sûds*, it may be remarked, (a) ה, ה, ו at the beginning of a syllable prefer ֿ , but א prefers ֿ , e. g. חֶסֶד *ass*, הָרֶם *to hill*, אָמַר *to say*; when however the tone syllable is moved further forward, the ֿ under א changes into the lighter ֿ , e. g. אָלִי (poetic for אֶלִי) *to*, but אָלֶיךָ *to you*, אָכַל *to eat*, but אָכַלְתָּ (*ʾakhal*, toneless on account of Maqqeph). Comp. § 27, Rem. 5. Likewise ֿ is naturally found under א in cases where the *Haṭeph* arises from a weakening of an original *ā* (e. g. אָרִי *lion*, ground-form *ʾary*), and ֿ if there be a weakening of an original *u* (e. g. אָנִי *a fleet*, אָנִי *affliction*, comp. § 93, Rem. 3 and 6. c).

p (b) In the middle of a word after a long vowel, a *Haṭeph-Pathah* occurs instead of a simple *Sûd mobile*, e. g. מַאֲנֶה, הַעֲלָה (see § 63, Rem. 4); but if a short vowel precedes, the choice of the *Haṭeph* is regulated by it, e. g. *Perf.* הַעֲמִיד (see above, No. 2, Rem. 2), *Infim.* הַעֲמִיד (after the form הַעֲמִיל); *Perf. Hoph.* הַעֲמִיד (after הַעֲמִיל); but cf. שָׁחַד Job 6, 22 (§ 64. 1).

q 5. The ר, which in sound approximates to the gutturals (§ 6. c), shares with the gutturals proper their first, and to a certain extent their second, peculiarity, viz.

(a) The exclusion of the doubling, to compensate for which the preceding vowel is almost always lengthened, e. g. בִּרְרַח *he has blessed* for *birrah*, בִּרְרַח *to bless* for *barrēkh*.

r (b) The preference for *ā* as a preceding vowel, e. g. וַיֵּרָא *and he saw* (from וַיֵּרָא); וַיֵּסָר *and he turned back*, also for וַיֵּסָר *and he caused to turn back*.

s The exceptions to letter *a* are מִרְרַח *mōrrāh*, Prov. 14, 10; כִּרְרַח *khōrrāh* and שִׁרְרַח *šōrrāh*, Ezek. 16, 4 (comp. Prov. 3, 8); שִׁרְרַח *šōrrāh* Song 5, 2; הַעֲמִיד *hāʿamīd* 1 Sam. 1, 6; הַרְרַח *hōrrāh* 1 Sam. 10, 24. 17, 25. 2 Ki. 6, 32; הַרְרַח *hōrrāh* Jud. 20, 43 (cf. § 20. 2 b); מִרְרַח *mōrrāh* 1 Sam. 23, 28. 2 Sam. 18, 16; also on account of דחיק (§ 20. c) Jer. 22, 22. Prov. 15, 1. 20, 22. 2 Chron. 26, 10; and אֲחִי מִרְרַח (§ 20. f) 1 Sam. 15, 6. Jer. 39, 12. Hab. 3, 13. Prov. 11, 21. Job 39, 9. Ezra 9, 6. A kind of virtual doubling (after ר for ר) is found in מִרְרַח Is. 14, 3. In Samaritan and Arabic this doubling has been retained throughout, and the LXX write e. g. *šōrrā* for שִׁרְרַח.

§ 23. The Feebleness of the Aspirates א and ה.

a 1. The א, a light and scarcely audible guttural, as a rule entirely loses its slight consonantal power whenever it stands without a vowel at the end of a syllable. It then serves (like the German *h* in *roh*, *geh*, *nahle*) merely as a sign of the preceding long vowel, e. g. מִרְרַח, מִרְרַח (but when a syllable is added with an introductory vowel, according to No. 2, e. g. מִרְרַח, מִרְרַח, since the א then stands at the

beginning of the syllable, not *מַצְאֵי*, *הוֹצְאֵי*), *מָצָא*, *קָלָא* (comp., however, § 74. 1), *מַצְאֵהָ* (for *māṣa'ā*), *הַמַּצְאֵהָ*. Similarly in cases like *חָטָא*, *וִירָא*, *שָׁא*, &c. (§ 19. 1), and even in *חָטָא*, *שָׁא* (see above, § 22. c), the א has only an orthographic significance.

2. On the other hand, א is generally retained as a strong consonant *b* whenever it begins a syllable, e.g. *אָמַר*, *חָמַס*, or when it is protected by a *Hateph* in a partially closed syllable, e.g. *לֶאֱבֹל*, and, as an exception, even in a closed syllable with quiescent *Šwā* after a preceding *Sghōl*, e.g. *וַיִּאָמַר*, *נֶדְאָר* *ne'dār*. Even in such cases the consonantal power of א may be entirely lost,

(a) when it would stand with a long vowel in the middle of *c* a word after *Šwā mobile*. The long vowel is then occasionally thrown back into the place of the *Šwā*, and the א is only retained orthographically, as an indication of the etymology, e.g. *רָאשִׁים* *heads* (for *r'āšīm*), *מֵאֵים* *two hundred* (for *m'ālayim*), *שְׁאֵמָה* Ezek. 25, 6 for *שְׁמָה*; *בִּרְאָה* Neh. 6, 8 for *בִּרְאָה*; *מֵאֵים* Job 31, 7. Dan. 1, 4 for *מֵאֵים*; *פֶּאֱרָה* for *פֶּאֱרָה* Is. 10, 33; *חֲסִים* *hōšīm*, 1 Sam. 14, 33 for *חֲסִים* (comp. § 74, Rem. 2, and § 75, Rem. 21); *הֶרְאֵנִי* Num. 34, 14, from *הֶרְאֵנִי*; so always *חֲפֹאֶה* or *חֲפֹאֶה* 1 Kings 14, 16. Mic. 1, 5, &c., for *חֲפֹאֶה*. Sometimes a still more violent suppression of the א occurs at the beginning of a syllable, which then causes a further change in the preceding syllable, e.g. *מְלָאכָה* *work* for *מְלָאכָה*, *יְשַׁמְעֵאל* for *יְשַׁמְעֵאל*; *יְשַׁמְעֵאל* or *יְשַׁמְעֵאל* *the left hand*, ground-form *sam'āl*.

(b) When it originally closed a syllable. In Hebrew א is then generally *d* (by § 22. 4) pronounced with a *Hateph*, *ֶֿ* or *ֶֿֿ*. The preceding short vowel is, however, sometimes lengthened and retains the following א only orthographically, e.g. *וַיִּצְעַל* Num. 11, 25 for *וַיִּצְעַל* (comp. Judg. 9, 41), and *פֶּאֱרָה* Joel 2, 6 for *פֶּאֱרָה*; *יֶאֱבֹל* obscured from *יֶאֱבֹל* for *יֶאֱבֹל* (comp., however, § 68. 1); *לֶאֱמֹר*, &c. The short vowel is retained, although the consonantal power of א is entirely lost, in *וַאֲרֵנִי*, &c. (see § 102. 2), *וַאֲרֵנִי* Is. 41, 25, *וַאֲרֵנִי* Ezek. 28, 16 for *וַאֲרֵנִי*; comp. Deut. 24, 10. 1 Kings 11, 39. Is. 10, 13.

Instead of this א which has lost its consonantal value, there is often written one of *e* the vowel letters י and ו according to the nature of the sound, the former with *ē* and the latter with *ē* and *ē*, e.g. *בִּירָא* *cistern* for *בִּירָא*, *בִּירָא* *buffalo* for *בִּירָא*; comp. also *לֹא* for *לֹא* not 1 Sam. 2, 16 and frequently in the *K'ithbā*. At the end of the word ה also is written for א, *יִמְלֵה* *he fills* for *יִמְלֵה* Job 8, 21 (see below, No. 4, Rem.).

f 3. When **א** is only a vowel letter or an indication of the etymology (quiescent), it is also sometimes entirely dropped (cf. § 19. *k*), e.g. **יָחִי** Job 1, 21 for **יָחִי**; **כָּלִי** Job 32, 18 for **כָּלִי**; **תּוֹמָם** Gen. 25, 24 for **תּוֹמָם**; **אֲחִינֹחַ** 31, 39 for **אֲחִינֹחַ**; **שָׁלַח** 1 Sam. 1, 17 for **שָׁלַח**; **רָמִים** Ps. 22, 22 for **רָמִים**; **נָחָה** Job 22, 29 for **נָחָה**; **הַבְּאֵר** 1 Chron. 11, 39 for **הַבְּאֵר**, and so 2 Sam. 23, 37; **שָׁרִית** 1 Chron. 12, 38 for **שָׁרִית**; **לְהַשְׁמֹחַ** 2 Ki. 19, 25 *K'thbbh* for **לְהַשְׁמֹחַ** (comp. Is. 37, 26); **חֲמָה** Job 29, 6 for **חֲמָה**. In **מַלְאָךְ** 1 Ki. 5, 25 (for **מַלְאָךְ**) the strengthening of the following consonant by Dageš compensates for the loss of the **א**; but in **מַלְאָךְ** Ezek. 20, 37 (if for **מַלְאָךְ**) the preceding vowel is lengthened; cf. above, No. 2. On **אָמַר** for **אָמַר** see § 68. 2.

g Rem. 1. In Aramaic the **א** is much weaker and more liable to change than in Hebrew. In literary Arabic, on the other hand, it is almost always a firm consonant. According to Arabic orthography, **א** serves also to indicate a long *a*, whereas in Hebrew it very rarely occurs as a mere vowel letter after Qameṣ; as in **קָמַח** Hos. 10, 14 for **קָמַח** *he rose up*; **רָאשׁ** Prov. 10, 4, 13, 23 for **רָאשׁ** *poor*; but in 2 Sam. 11, 1 the *K'thbbh* **רַשְׁמֵי** *the messengers*, is the proper reading; comp. § 7. 2.

h 2. In some cases at the beginning of a word, the **א**, instead of taking a compound *aw*, retains the corresponding long vowel, e.g. **אָזָר** *girdle* for **אָזָר**; cf. § 84. *a*, No. 12, Rem., and the analogous cases in § 52, note, § 63, Rem. 4, § 76. *d*, and § 93, Rem. 3 (**אָהֳלִים**).

i 3. An **א** is sometimes added at the end of the word to a final *a*, *i*, and *o*, e.g. **הָלַכְוּ** Jos. 10, 24 (before **א**), **אָבוֹא** Is. 28, 12. These examples, however, are not so much instances of 'Arabic orthography,' as early scribal errors, as in **נִשְׁמָא** Jer. 10, 5 for **נִשְׁמָא**; and in **נִשְׁמָא** Ps. 139, 20 for **נִשְׁמָא**. Comp. also **יְהוּא** Eccl. 11, 3 (§ 75, Rem. 3. *e*); **נְקִיָּא** for **נְקִי** *pure*; **לֵוָא** for **לֵוִי** *if*; **אֲמֹא** for **אֲמֹ** *thus*; **רְבֹוא** for **רְבוֹ** *myriad*, Neh. 7, 66. 72. On **הוּא** and **הִיא** see § 32, Rem. 6.

k 4. The **ה** is stronger and firmer than the **א**, and never loses its consonantal sound (i.e. *quiesces*) in the middle of a word¹; on the other hand, at the end of a word it is always a mere vowel letter, unless it is expressly marked by *Mappiq* as a strong consonant (§ 14. 1). Yet at times the consonantal sound of **ה** at the end of a word is lost,

¹ In Jer. 22, 23, **נְחֻתָּה** is unquestionably a corruption of **נְחֻתָּה** for **נְחֻתָּה**.

² Only apparent exceptions are such *proper names* as **עֲשָׂהֵל**, **פְּרָחֵזֶר**, which are compounded of two words and consequently are sometimes divided. Cf. forms like **חֻזְאֵל** for **חֻזְאֵל**. Here belongs also **יְסֻהֲמִיָּה**, which occurs in many MSS. for the artificially divided form **יְסֻהֲמִיָּה** in the printed texts, Jer. 46, 20.

and a simple ה or more correctly ה̄ (with *Raphé* as an indication of the weakening) takes its place, e.g. הָלָה to her for הָלָה, Zech. 5, 11 and elsewhere (comp. § 103. g, also § 58. g, and § 91. e). Finally, in very many cases a complete elision of the consonantal ה takes place by *syncope*: (a) when its vowel is thrown back to the place of a preceding *Swaḍ mobile* (see above, letter c, with א), e.g. לִפְסָר for לְהִפְסָר (the ה of the article being syncopated as it almost always is); מְהַאֲרֵן for מְהַאֲרֵן; יִהְיֶהֱפָר for יִהְיֶהֱפָר; יִהְיֶהֱפָר Impf. *Hiph'il* for יִהְיֶהֱפָר; יִהְיֶהֱפָר for יִהְיֶהֱפָר; יִהְיֶהֱפָר Ezek. 27, 32. (b) By contraction of the vowels preceding and following the ה, e.g. סוּסָה (also written סוּסָה) from *sāsahu* (a + u = o). A violent suppression of ה together with its vowel occurs in פֶּם (from פֶּהם), &c.

Rem. In connexion with \bar{o} and \bar{e} , a η which only marks the vowel ending is occasionally changed into ι or ι' ($\eta\alpha = \eta\alpha\iota$, $\eta\epsilon = \eta\epsilon\iota$ Hos. 6, 9), and in all cases into \aleph in the later Aramaic orthography, especially with \bar{a} , e.g. $\aleph\bar{a}\bar{w}$ *sleep* Ps. 127, 2 for $\eta\bar{a}\bar{w}$; $\aleph\bar{a}\bar{s}$ Jer. 23, 39 for $\eta\bar{a}\bar{s}$, &c. Thus it is evident that final η as a vowel letter has only an orthographical importance.

§ 24. *Changes of the Weak Letters י and י.*

The *y* and *y* are, as consonants, so weak, and approach so nearly *a* to the corresponding vowels *y* and *i* (comp. § 5, *b*, note 1), that under... certain conditions they very readily merge into them. This fact is especially important for the formation of those weak stems, in which *y* or *y* occurs as one of the three radical consonants (§ 69 sqq., § 85, § 93).

1. The cases in which y and y lose their consonantal power, i. e. merge into a vowel, belong almost exclusively to the middle and end of words; at the beginning they remain as consonants¹.

The cases are to be further distinguished—

(a) When either י or ם with *quiescent* *šwā* stands at the end of a syllable immediately after a *homogeneous* vowel (u or i), it has not strength enough in this position to maintain the consonantal sound, but merges in the homogeneous vowel. More accurately they pass into vowels (י into u, ם into i), and are thus contracted with the preceding vowel into *one* vowel which is necessarily long, but they are mostly retained orthographically as vowel letters. Thus חוּשׁ for חוּשׁ; חוּשׁ for חוּשׁ;

¹ *i* for *y* and, alone is a standing exception, see § 26. 1 and § 104. 2. [It is more probable a *y* is here written defectively after *i*, than that this should be an exception to such a fundamental principle.—G. W. C.] On the cases where *i* is softened to *y* at the beginning of a word, comp. § 47. 2, note.

יִצְיָ for יִצְיָ; so also at the end of the word, e.g. עֲבָרִי a *Hebrew*, properly 'ibry, hence fem. עֲבָרִיָּה; עֲשֵׂה Job 41, 25 for עֲשֹׂה (comp. עֲשִׂיתוּ 1 Sam. 25, 18 *K'thithh*). On the other hand, if the preceding vowel be heterogeneous, ו and י are retained as strong consonants (see § 8. 5), e.g. שָׁלוֹם quiet, וַי the month of May, גּוֹי nation, גָּלוּי revealed. But with a preceding *ā* the ו and י are mostly contracted into *ō* and *ē* (see below, 2, *ō*), though at the end of a word they are sometimes rejected (see below, 2, *ō*, Rem.).

c Thus an initial י coalesces after the prefixes בּ, ל, מ, נ, which are then pronounced with *y* (comp. § 28. 1), and also almost always after פ (see § 102. *ō*), with the *y* to *ē*, e.g. בְּיָדָהּ in Judah (for בְּיָדָהּ), וְיָדָהּ and Judah, כְּיָרֵךְ as the Nile, לְיָדָהּ for Judah, מִיָּדָהּ from the hands of.

d (*ō*) When ו and י without a vowel would stand at the end of the word after *quiescent Šwā*, they are either wholly rejected and only orthographically replaced by ה (e.g. בָּכָה from *bakhy*, as well as the regularly formed בָּכָה weeping; comp. for these forms, § 93. 1, Rem. 6) or become again vowel letters. In the latter case י becomes homogeneous *Hireq*, and also attracts to itself the tone, whilst the preceding vowel becomes *Šwā* (e.g. פִּירָה from *piry*, properly *pary*); ו is changed sometimes into a toneless *u* (e.g. תִּחְוָה from *tuhw*).

e Rem. In Syriac, where the feeble letters more readily become vowel sounds, a simple *i* may stand at the beginning of words instead of י or י. The LXX also, in accordance with this, write 'Ιουδά for יְהוּדָה, 'Ιουάν for יְהוֹנָתָן. Hence may be explained the Syriac usage (occurring also in Hebrew) of drawing back the vowel *i* to the preceding consonant, when it properly had a simple vocal *Šwā*, e.g. (according to the reading of Ben-Naphtali¹) וַיִּלְלָתָה Jer. 25, 36 for וַיִּלְלָתָה (so Baer), בְּיָתְרוֹ Eccles. 2, 13 for בְּיָתְרוֹ, even וַיִּחְלָה Job 29, 21 (in some editions) for וַיִּחְלָה. According to Qimhi יִקְטֹל was pronounced as *iqāl*, and therefore the pointing in the 1st pers. was יִקְטֹל to avoid confusion. In fact the Babylonian punctuation always has *i* for *ē* in the 1st pers. In Ps. 45, 10 and Prov. 30, 17, instead of בְּיָקְרוֹתָי and לִיקְרָתָה (so Ben-Naphtali), Baer has recently adopted the readings of Ben-Ašer, בְּיָקְרָתָי and לִיקְרָתָה (comp. *Dikduke ha-š'amim*, p. 14).

f 2. With regard to the choice of the long vowel, in which ו and י quiesce after such a vocalization and contraction, the following rules may be laid down:

¹ According to Abulwalid, Ben-Naphtali regarded the *Yodā* in all such cases as a vowel letter.

(a) With a short *homogeneous* vowel ι and ϵ are contracted into their corresponding long vowel (δ or ϵ), see above, 1. a.

(b) With δ they form the diphthongs δ and ϵ according to § 7. 1, e. g. מִיָּטִיב from מִיָּטִיב; יוֹשִׁיב from יוֹשִׁיב, &c.¹

Rem. The above-mentioned rejection of the half vowels ι and ϵ (letter δ) occurs especially at the end of words after a heterogeneous vowel (δ), when according to the nature of the form the contraction appears impossible. So especially in verbs יָלַד , e. g. originally $\text{יָלַד} = (\text{י})\text{לָלַד} = \text{יָלַד}$, since δ after the rejection of the ι stands in an open syllable, and consequently must be lengthened to δ . The η is simply an orthographic sign of the long vowel. So also יָלַד for yālāw . On the development of יָלַד from יָלַד , see § 75. 1; on קָם as perf. and part. of קָם , see § 72. 2 and 4; on יָלַד , &c., from יָלַד , see § 69. 1.

§ 25. Firm or Immovable Vowels.

What vowels in Hebrew are firm and immovable can be known, *a* certainly and fully, only from the nature of the grammatical forms, and in some cases from a comparison with Arabic (comp. § 1. m). This holds especially of the *essentially* long vowels, i. e. those long by *nature or contraction*, as distinguished from those which are only *lengthened for the sake of rhythm*, i. e. on account of the special laws which in Hebrew regulate the tone and the formation of syllables. The latter, when a change takes place in the position of the tone or in the division of syllables, readily become short again, or are reduced to a mere *vocal S'wa*.

1. The essentially long and consequently, as a rule, unchangeable δ vowels of the *second and third* class, ϵ , δ , ϵ , δ , can mostly be recognized by means of the vowel letters which accompany them ($\text{י} \text{---}$, $\text{י} \text{---}$, $\text{י} \text{---}$, $\text{י} \text{---}$); e. g. יָטִיב *he does well*, יָיִב *palace*, יָבֵל *boundary*, קוֹל *voice*. The defective writing (§ 8. 4) is indeed common enough, e. g. יָטִיב and יָטִיב for יָטִיב ; יָבֵל for יָבֵל ; קל for קוֹל , but this is *merely an orthographic*

¹ Instances in which no contraction takes place after δ are, מִיָּטִיב 1 Chron. 12, 2 (comp. § 70. 2); מִיָּטִיב Hos. 7, 12; הָיִשׁ Ps. 5, 9 *Qrd*; the locatives בְּיָיִב , בְּיָיִב , &c. Sometimes both forms are found, as עוֹלָה and עוֹלָה ; comp. חַי *living*, constr. state חַי . Analogous is the contraction of מָוֶת (ground-form *mawt*) *death*, constr. state מָוֶת ; עַיִן (ground-form *'ayn* [*'ain*]) *eye*, constr. עַיִן .

² The Arabic, in such cases, often writes etymologically يَلِي , but pronounces *galā*. So the LXX יָלַד *galā*. But even in Arabic يَلِي is written for يَلِي and pronounced *salā*.

licence and has no influence on the quantity of the vowel; the *d* in *גָּבֵל* is just as necessarily long, as in *גָּבִיל*, comp. § 8. 4.

As an exception, a merely tone-long vowel of both these classes is sometimes written *fully*, e.g. *יָסֹבֵל* for *יָסֹבֵל*.

- c* 2. The essentially and naturally long *d* (*Qames impure*)¹, unless it has become *o* (comp. § 9. *g*), has as a rule in Hebrew no representative among the consonants, while in Arabic it is regularly indicated by *ḥ*; on the few instances of this kind in Hebrew, comp. § 9. 1, § 23. *g*. The naturally long *d* and the merely tone-long *a* can only be distinguished by an accurate knowledge of the forms.
- d* 3. Short vowels in sharpened syllables, i.e. before *Dageš forte*, are as a rule unchangeable, e.g. *גָּנֵב* thief, also generally in closed syllables (§ 26. 2, *b*) which are not final, e.g. *מִלְבָּשׁ* garment, *מִדְבָּר* wilderness, *מִמְלָכָה* kingdom.
- e* 4. Finally, those long vowels are unchangeable which, owing to the omission of the doubling in a guttural or *א*, have arisen by lengthening from the corresponding short vowels, e.g. *מִיִּן* for *mi''en*; *בִּרְרָה* for *burrah*.

§ 26. Syllable-formation² and its Influence on the Quantity of Vowels.

- a* Apart from the unchangeable vowels (§ 25), the use of short or long vowels, i.e. their lengthening, shortening or change into vocal *Šwā*, depends on the *theory of syllable-formation*. The initial and final syllables especially require careful consideration.

1. The *initial* syllable. Every syllable necessarily begins with a consonant, or, in the case of initial *י* and *י* (cf. note on § 5. *b*), a consonantal vowel³. The copula is the only exception to this rule⁴. According to the Tiberian pronunciation *י* and is softened into the corresponding

¹ The older grammarians (see Gesenius, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 160) called those vowels *impure* which should be properly followed by a vowel letter. Thus *גָּנֵב* was regarded as merely by licence for *גָּנֵבִי*, &c.

² Comp. C. H. Toy, 'The Syllable in Hebrew,' *Amer. Journal of Philol.*, 1884, p. 494 sqq.; H. Strack, 'The Syllables in the Hebrew Language,' *Hebraica*, Oct. 1884, p. 73 sqq.

³ The only exceptions are the few instances in which initial *Yodh* is represented as simple *i*, by being written *י* or *י*, see § 24. *e*, and especially § 47. *b*, note.

[⁴ This is not really an exception, *Sureq* was no doubt here written defectively, i.e. *י* for *י*.—G. W. C.]

§ 26.] *Syllable-formation, its Influence on Vowels.* 85

י before *Šwā*, and the labials, e. g. וִיבִיר, וִיבִירָה: the Babylonian punctuation, however, even in these cases has י, i. e. י. On the other hand, in such cases as וִיבִיר the ו is to be regarded as an initial consonant.

2. The *final* syllable. A syllable may end—

b

(a) With a vowel, and is then called an *open* or *simple* syllable, e. g. in וִיבִיר where the first and last are open. See No. 3.

(b) With *one* consonant, and is then called a *simple closed* or *compound* syllable, as the second in וִיבִיר, לִבִּי. See No. 5. Such are also the syllables *sharpened* by a following Dageš, as the first in וִיבִיר *qaf-šil*. See No. 6.

Rem. Between a and b comes the *loosely closed* or *wavering* syllable, e. g. מַלְכִּי *mal'khē*, כִּיתָּבִי *kith'bhū* (not *mal-ke*, *kith-bu*); compare for the *Šwā* (medium) § 10. d.

(c) With *two* consonants, a *doubly closed* syllable, as וִיבִיר *qōš't*, וִיבִירָה. d Comp. for this, No. 7 below and § 10. i-l.

3. *Open* or *simple* syllables have, as a rule, a *long* vowel, whether they have the tone as in וִיבִיר *in thee*, סֵפֶר *book*, סְנִיף *sanctuary*, or are toneless as in וִיבִיר, עֵנָב *a bunch of grapes*¹. A long vowel (Qameš, less frequently Šere) is especially common in an open syllable before the tone (pretonic vowel), e. g. וִיבִיר, וִיבִירָה, וִיבִירָה.

Short vowels in *open* syllables occur more or less apparently: . . .

(a) In *dissyllabic words* formed by means of a helping vowel (§ 28. 4) from monosyllables, as וִיבִיר *brook*, בֵּית *house*, יָרַב *let him increase*, from נַחַל, בַּיִת,

¹ In opposition to this fundamental law in Hebrew (a *long* vowel in an *open* syllable), the original short vowel is always found in Arabic, and sometimes in the other Semitic languages, except of course in the case of *naturally* long vowels. The above examples are pronounced in Arabic as *bikā*, *sifr*, *qāds*, *qātālā*, *'indā*. Although accordingly it is certain that in Hebrew also, at an earlier period, *short* vowels were pronounced in open syllables, it may still be doubted whether the present pronunciation depends *entirely* upon an artificial custom arising out of the solemn recitation of the text of the Old Testament. On this hypothesis we should have still to explain, e. g. the undoubtedly very old lengthening of *i* and *u* in an open syllable into *ē* and *ō*.

² For this pretonic vowel the Arabic regularly has a short vowel (*lāhūm*, *yāqūm*, &c.), the Aramaic simply a vocal *Šwā* (וִיבִיר, וִיבִירָה); and even in Hebrew, when the tone is thrown forward the pretonic vowel almost always becomes vocal *Šwā*, see § 27. It would, however, be incorrect to assume from this that the pretonic vowel takes the place of *Šwā* only on account of a following tone-syllable. It rather arises from an original short vowel, since such a vowel is mostly lengthened in an open syllable before the tone, but when the tone is moved further forward it becomes vocal *Šwā*.

yirb; comp. also יִרְב־ the ending of the dual (§ 88). But the helping vowel cannot in such cases be regarded as a full vowel, i.e. it does not completely open the closed syllable.

- g (b) In the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing. יָנִי (*me*), e.g. קָטַלְנִי (Arab. *qatlānī*). The not infrequent form יָנִי (Gen. 30, 6. Ps. 118, 18) proves that the tone-bearing *Pathah* produces a sharpening of the following liquid, and thus virtually stands in a closed syllable, even when the *Num* is not expressly written with *Dageš*. In cases like וְאָנִי (§ 102 at the end) *Pathah* is retained with the counter-tone after the *℣* has become quiescent.

- h (c) Sometimes before the toneless וְ local (§ 90. 2), e.g. מִדְבָּרָה towards the wilderness; only, however, in the const. state (1 Ki. 19, 15), since the toneless וְ does not affect the character of the form (especially when rapidly pronounced in close connexion); otherwise it is מִדְבָּרָה .

In all these cases the short vowel is supported by the tone (or principal tone) of the word (compare the effect of the *Arsis* on the short vowel in classical prosody). Elsewhere it has at least the support of the counter-tone (*Metheg*), viz.

- i (d) In the combinations וְיָ , וְיִ , וְיָ , וְיִ , e.g. וְיָנִי his boy, וְיָמָיו he will bind, וְיָמָיו his deed. In all these cases the syllable was at first really closed, and it was only when the guttural took a *Ḥateph* that it became in consequence open (but compare, e.g. וְיָמָיו with וְיָמָיו). The same vowel sequence arises wherever a preposition בְּ , כִּי , וְ , or וְ copulative is prefixed to an initial syllable which has a *Ḥateph*, since the former then takes the vowel contained in the *Ḥateph* (see § 102. 2 and § 104. 2, Rem.). In such cases the prefix forms with the *Ḥateph* one loosely closed syllable. To the same category belong also the cases where these prepositions with *Hireq* stand before a consonant with simple *Šwā* mobile, e.g. בְּרִיבֵר , כִּיבֵר , &c.

- k (e) In forms like וְיָנִי *yeḥ^h-s^h-qū* (they are strong), וְיָנִי *ṣṣ^h-kḥā* (thy deed). These again are cases of the subsequent opening of closed syllables (hence, e.g. וְיָנִי also occurs); וְיָנִי ought properly to be pronounced *ṣṣ^h-kḥā*; compare generally § 22. 4 at the end, and § 28. 3.

- l Such cases as וְיָנִי , וְיָנִי (§ 96), וְיָנִי (§ 67, Rem. 6) do not come under this head, since they all have *d* in a virtually sharpened syllable; nor does the tone-bearing *S^ghōl* which is lengthened from *d* in suffixes (e.g. וְיָנִי), and other cases, nor *S^ghōl* for *d* before a guttural with *Qameṣ* (§ 22. c). On וְיָנִי and וְיָנִי (*d* for וְיָנִי), see above, § 9. v.

m 4. The independent syllables with a firm vowel which have been described above, are frequently preceded by a single consonant with vocal *Šwā*, simple or compound. Such a consonant with vocal *Šwā* never has the value of an independent syllable, but rather attaches itself so closely to the following syllable, that it forms practically one syllable with it, e.g. וְיָנִי (cheek) *ṣṣ^h*; וְיָנִי (sickness) *ṣṣ^h*; וְיָנִי *yil-m^hdḥā*. This concerns especially the prefixes וְ , כִּי , וְ , וְ . See § 102.

- n The *Šwā* mobile was no doubt in all such cases weakened from an original full vowel (e.g. וְיָנִי Arab. *yaqtūlā*, וְיָנִי Arab. *blāḥ*, &c.); from this, however,

it cannot be inferred that the *Masoretes* regarded it as forming a kind of *open* syllable, for this would be even more directly opposed to their fundamental law, (viz. that a long vowel should stand in an open syllable,) than are the exceptions cited above in No. 3. Even the use of *Metheg* with *Šwā* in particular cases (see § 16. 2) is no proof of such a view on the part of the *Masoretes*.

5. *Closed* syllables ending with one consonant, when without the *o* tone, necessarily have short vowels, whether at the beginning or at the end of words¹, e.g. מַלְכָּה *queen*, הַשְׁבוּן *understanding*, חֵכְמָה *wisdom*, הָיָה and he turned back, וַיָּשָׁב, וַיָּשָׁב (wayyāqōm).

In a *tone-bearing* closed syllable there may be either a long or short vowel, but if the latter, it must as a rule be either *Pathah* or *Seghōl*². The tone-bearing closed penultima admits, of the long vowels, only the tone-long *ā, ē, ō*, not the longest *ī, ē, ō, ā*; of the short vowels, only *ă, ě*, not *ĭ, ŭ, ă*. Thus יָשָׁב (3rd pl. masc. Imperf. Hiph.) but יָשָׁבָה 3rd pl. fem., and יָשָׁב (2nd pl. masc. Imperat. Qal) but יָשָׁבָה fem.

6. A special kind of closed syllables are the *sharpened*, i.e. those which end in the same consonant with which the following syllable begins, e.g. יָמַי 'im-mē, כָּלִי kāl-lī. If without the tone, they have, like the rest, short vowels; but if bearing the tone, either short vowels as יָמַי, כָּלִי, or long, as יָמַי, כָּלִי.

On the omission of the doubling of a consonant at the end of a word, see § 20.

7. Syllables ending with two consonants occur only at the end of words, and have most naturally short vowels, מַלְכֵי, מַלְכֵי; but sometimes *Sere*, as מַלְכֵי, מַלְכֵי, or *Holem*, מַלְכֵי, מַלְכֵי. Compare, however, § 10. 3. Usually the harshness of pronunciation is avoided by the use of a helping vowel (§ 28. 4).

§ 27. *The Change of the Vowels, especially as regards Quantity.*

The changes in sound through which the Hebrew language passed, *a* before it assumed the form in which we know it from the *Masoretic*

¹ In exceptions such as שָׁחַד Gen. 4, 25 (where *šā* is required by the character of the form, although the closed syllable has lost the tone owing to the following *Maqqeph*), *Metheg* is used to guard against a wrong pronunciation; sometimes *ā* is retained before *Maqqeph*, e.g. שָׁחַד Gen. 2, 13; שָׁחַד Gen. 2, 16.

² See § 9. 2, 3. *ĭ* occurs thus only in the particles וְ, וְ, וְ; but these usually (וְ always) are rendered toneless by a following *Maqqeph*. Compare also such forms as וְשָׁחַד § 75. 9 and וְשָׁחַד § 29. 8.

text of the Old Test. (see § 2. 4), have especially affected its vowel system. A precise knowledge of these vowel changes, which is indispensable for the understanding of the greater part of the present forms of the language, is derived partly from the phenomena which the language itself presents in the laws of derivation and inflexion, partly from the comparison of the kindred dialects, principally the Arabic. By these two methods, we arrive at the following facts as regards Hebrew :

- b 1. That in an open syllable the language has frequently retained only a half-vowel (*Šwā mobile*), where there originally stood a full short vowel, e.g. עֲגָלָה (ground-form 'ägälät) a waggon, עֲדָה (ground-form šädäqät) righteousness, קָטַל (Arab. qätälä), יָקַטַל (Arab. jüqatülä).
- c 2. That vowels originally short have in the tone-syllable, as also in the open syllable preceding it, been generally changed into the corresponding tone-long vowels, ä into ā, i into ē, u into ō (see § 9, No. 1. 2, No. 7, and No. 10. 3). If however the tone be shifted or weakened, these tone-long vowels mostly revert to their original shortness, or, occasionally, are still further shortened, and vanish into a mere *Šwā mobile*, or, finally, are entirely lost through a change in the division of syllables; e.g. מָטָר (Arab. mātār) rain, in close dependence on a following genitive (in the *construct state*), becomes מֵטָר, עֲקֵב (Arab. 'aqīb) heel, dual עֲקִיבִים, dual *construct* (with attenuation of the original ā of the first syllable to i) עֲקִיבִי; יָקַטַל (Arab. jüqatül), plur. יָקַטְלוּ (Arab. jüqatülä). For instances of complete loss, as in יָקַטַל, comp. § 93. m.

According to § 26, the following details of vowel-change must be observed :

- d 1. In place of a tone-lengthened vowel, the original, or a kindred short vowel reappears—

(a) When a closed syllable loses the tone (§ 26. 5). Thus, יָ hand, but when the tone is moved forward יָדֵהוּ the hand of Yahwe; בֶּן son, but בֶּן־הַמֶּלֶךְ the son of the king; כָּל the whole, but כָּל־הָעָם the whole of the people; so also when an accented closed syllable becomes, through inflexion, loosely closed, e.g. אֹיֵב enemy, אֹיֵבֶךָ thy enemy; finally, when the tone recedes, יָקַם, וָיָקַם (wayyāqōm); וָיָלַךְ, וָיָלַךְ.

(b) When in place of an open syllable with a tone-long vowel there arises, through lengthening of the word, a fully or half-closed toneless syllable, e.g. סֵפֶר book, סֵפֶרִי my book; מִקְדָּשׁ sanctuary, מִקְדָּשִׁי my sanctuary.

In such cases, according to what has been said, *e* passes into *i* or *ē* (under certain circumstances also into *ā*; comp. § 93, Parad. II, *c* and *e*), and *ō* into *ō*, rarely into *ū*. On the change of a closed syllable with a long vowel into a sharpened syllable, *e* reverts to the original *i*, *ō* mostly to *ū*, e. g. **אִמִּי** *mother*, **אִמִּי** *my mother*; **חֹתֵן** *law*, plur. **חֹתָנִים**; but **עֹז** *strength*, **עֹזִי** *my strength*.

2. The lengthening of the short vowel to the corresponding long, *e* takes place—

(a) When a closed syllable becomes open by its final consonant being transferred to a suffix beginning with a vowel, or in general to the following syllable, e. g. **הָרַחֵל לוֹ** *he has killed him*; **מִיָּדָיו** primarily from **מִדָּתָו**: so *ā* mostly becomes *ā* even before a suffix beginning with *šwā mobile*; e. g. **מִשְׁלָךְ** from **מִשְׁלָךְ**.

(b) When a syllable has become open by complete loss of the *f* doubling in its final consonant, a guttural or a *Reš*, e. g. **הִרְרַחֵל** for *birrah*, see § 22. 1. Comp. also § 20. n.

(c) When a weak consonant (**א**, **י**, **ו**) following the short vowel, *g* according to § 23. 1, 2, 24. 2, quiesces in this vowel, e. g. **מִצָּדָה** for **מִצָּדָה**, where the **א**, losing its consonantal value, loses also the power of closing the syllable, and the open syllable requires a long vowel.

(d) Very frequently through the influence of the *pause*, i. e. the *h* principal tone in the last word of a sentence or clause (§ 29. 4). Sometimes also through the influence of the article (§ 35. o).

3. When a word increases at the end and the tone is consequently *i* moved forward, or when, in the *construct state* (see § 89), or otherwise in close connexion with the following word, its tone is weakened, in such cases a full vowel (short or tone-long) may, by the change in the division of syllables, be weakened to *šwā mobile* (or *šwā medium*), or even be entirely lost, so that its place is taken by the mere syllable-divider (*šwā quiescens*). Examples of the first case are, **שֵׁם** *name*, pl. **שֵׁמוֹת**, but **שְׁמִי** *my name*, **שְׁמוֹתָם** *their names*, **דְּבַר** *word*, constr. st. **דְּבַר**; **צִדְקָה** *righteousness*, constr. st. **צִדְקָתָהּ** (with *šwā medium*); an example of the second case is, **בְּרָכָה** *blessing*, constr. st. **בְּרָכָהּ**. Whether the vowel is retained or becomes vocal *šwā* (**דִּם**, **דְּמִי**, but **שֵׁם**, **שְׁמִי**), and which of the two disappears in two consecutive syllables, depends upon the character of the form in question. In general the rule is that only those vowels which stand in an open syllable can become vocal *šwā*.

Thus the change into *Šwā* takes place in—

- k* (a) The *ā* and *ē* of the first syllable (especially in the inflexion of nouns), e.g. דָּבָר *word*, plur. דְּבָרִים; גְּדוֹלָה *great*, fem. גְּדוּלָה; לֵבָב *heart*, plur. לְבָבִי *my heart*. Compare, however, also in the verb, תֵּשָׁב *she will return*, plur. תֵּשָׁבֶינָה; and so always, when the original short vowel of the prefixes of the Imperfect comes to stand in an open syllable. On the other hand, the *ā*, which, before the tone, has been lengthened from *ā*, is retained in the *Perfect consecutive* of Qal even in the secondary tone, e.g. וְקָטְלוּ; comp. § 49. *i*.
- l* (b) The short, or merely tone-long, vowels *a, e, o* of the ultima, especially in verbal forms, e.g. קָטְלָה fem. קָטְלוּ *qātālā*; יִקְטֹל *yiqṭāl*; comp., however, also יִלְכְּטֹן, יִלְכְּטִין, &c., according to § 47. *m* and *o*. The helping vowels are either entirely omitted, e.g. מַלְכִּי *king* (ground-form *malk*), מִלְכִּי *my king*; or become weakened into *Šwā mobile*, or *Šwā medium*, e.g. נָעַר *boy*, נָעָר *his boy*. If the tone remains unmoved, the vowel also is retained, notwithstanding the lengthening of the word, e.g. יִקְטְלוּ *pausal-form* for יִקְטֹלוּ.
- m* Where the tone moves forward two places, the former of the two vowels of a dissyllabic word may be shortened, and the second changed into *Šwā*. Comp. דָּבָר *word*; in the plur. דְּבָרִים; with heavy suffix דְּבָרֵיהֶם (comp. § 28. 1) *their words*. On the shortening (attenuation) of the *ā* to *i*, see further, Rem. 3.
- n* Rem. 1. An *ō* arising from *aw = au*, or by an obscuring of *ā* (see § 9), sometimes becomes *ū*, when the tone is moved forward, e.g. נִקְמוּ, נִקְמוּהוּ (see Paradigm *Perf. Niph.*); מְנִיחָה fem. מְנִיחָה, with suffix מְנִיחָה. Similarly the *ē*, arising from *ay = ai*, in the Perfect of verbs לִיחַ (§ 75. 2) frequently becomes *i*. The not uncommon use of *y* in a sharpened syllable, as בָּרַחְיָי Ez. 20, 18 (for בָּרַחְיָי), is to be regarded as an orthographic licence, although sometimes in such cases *ū* may really have been intended by the *Kʿtāb*.
- o* Of the vowels of the *U-class*, *ū* and tone-long *ō* stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and *ū* in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקֻם *he will arise*, יָקָם jussive, let him arise, יָקָם and he arose. The only instance of *ū* in an ultima which has lost the tone is יָקָם Ex. 16, 20 (see § 67. *n*). Similarly, of vowels of the *I-class*, *i*, *ē*, and *ē* stand in a tone-bearing closed final syllable, and *i* in a toneless syllable, e.g. יָקֻם *he will raise*, יָקָם let him raise, יָקָם and he raised. The only instance of *i* in an ultima which has lost the tone, is יָקָם Judg. 9, 53 (see § 67. *x*).
- p* 2. In the place of a *Pathah* we not unfrequently find (according to § 9. 3) a *Šghōl*, *ē* or *ē*, as a modification of *ā*:
- (a) In a closed antepenultima, e.g. מִלְכִּי (pr. name) for מִלְכִּי; or in a closed penultima (e.g. מִלְכִּי) or half-closed penultima (e.g. מִלְכִּי *your hand*, for *yad khēm*).

In all these cases the character of the surrounding consonants (see § 6. *q*) has no doubt had some influence.

(*b*) Regularly before a guttural with *Qameṣ*, where the doubling *q* has been dropped, provided that a lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qameṣ* be not necessary, e.g. אָחָיו *his brothers*, for 'ahāw; פָּדוּשׁ *false*, for kahāš; פָּחַם *coal*; הָיָה *the living* (with the article הַ); יִתְנַחֵם Num. 23, 19, &c., and so always before הָ. Before הָ and שׁ *S'ghöl* generally stands only in the second syllable before the tone, e.g. הַהָרִים *the mountains*; הַעֵץ *the guilt*; immediately before the tone *Pathah* is lengthened into a (pretonic) *Qameṣ*, e.g. הָרַר, הָעַם; but cf. also הַשָּׂדֶה Num. 8, 7. Before the weak consonants מ and נ (comp. § 22. 1, 5), the lengthening of the *Pathah* into *Qameṣ* almost always takes place, e.g. הָאָב *the father*, pl. הָאָבוֹת; הָרֹאשׁ *the head*, pl. הָרִאשִׁים. Exceptions, הָרָה *towards the mountain*, Gen. 14, 10, in the tone-syllable, for hārrā; יִבְרָכֶיךָ (pr. name) for יִבְרָכְךָ. On הָ as a form of the interrogative הַ (הָ), see § 100. 4; on קָה for קָה (קָה), § 37. 1. Finally, אָכַלְךָ Ex. 33, 3 also comes partly under this head, in consequence of the loss of the doubling, for אָכַלְךָ.

(*c*) As a modification of the original *Pathah* in the first class of the segholate forms (§ 93, Rem. 1), when a helping vowel (§ 28. 4) is inserted after the second consonant. Thus the ground-form *kalb* (*dog*), after receiving a helping *S'ghöl*, is modified into קָלֵב (also in modern Arabic pronounced *kelb*)¹, *yarh* (*month*) with a helping *Pathah*, יָרַח. The same phenomenon appears also in the forms of verbs, in cases like יָגַל (jussive of the Hiph'il of יָגַל), with a helping *S'ghöl*, for *yagil*.

3. The attenuation of *ḍ* to *ṭ* occurs very frequently in a toneless, closed, or *s* half-closed syllable.

(*a*) In a firmly closed syllable, מִדָּו *his measure*, for מִדָּו (in a sharpened syllable); יָלַדְתִּיךָ *I have begotten thee*, from יָלַדְתִּיךָ with the suffix יָךְ; comp. Lev. 11, 44. Ex. 38, 23 and § 44. *d*. Especially is this the case in a large number of *segholates* from the ground-form *qaṭl*, when combined with singular suffixes, e.g. צַדִּיקִי *my righteousness*, for *ṣadqī*.

(*b*) In a half-closed syllable, דְּמָמָה *your blood*, for דְּמָמָה, and so commonly in the *st. constr. plur.* of *segholates* from the ground-form *qaṭl*, e.g. בְּגָדֵיךָ from בְּגָד (ground-form *baḡd*) *a garment*. In most cases of this kind the attenuation is easily intelligible from the nature of the surrounding consonants. It is evident from a comparison of the dialects, that the attenuation was consistently carried out in a very large number of noun and verb-forms in Hebrew, as will be shown in the proper place².

¹ So the LXX write Μελαχισδέν for מִלְכִּי־שָׁדָן.

² Analogous to this attenuation of *ḍ* to *ṭ*, is the Lat. *tango, attingo; latus, prolixus*; to the transition of *ḍ* into *ṭ* (see above, Rem. 2), the Lat. *carpo, decerpo; spargo, conspergo*.

- u 4. *S^ghöl* arises, in addition to the cases mentioned in Rem. 1 and 2, also—
 (a) From the weakening of *ā* of the final syllable in the isolated cases (הַ— for הַ—) in 1 Sam. 28, 15 († see § 48. d). Ps. 20, 4 (†). Is. 59, 5. Prov. 24, 14 (see § 48. f); for examples of Locative forms in הַ— see § 90. 2 end.
- v (b) Perhaps from the obtusion of *u*, in אַתָּם *you* (Arab. *‘antūm*), see § 32. i and *m*, and in לָהֶם *to them* (Arab. *lahūm*); comp. § 8. c, 5.
- w 5. Among the *Ḥaṭeph*-sounds (ֿ) is shorter and lighter than (ֿ), and consequently the vowel group (ֿֿֿ) is shorter than (ֿֿֿֿֿ); e.g. אֶדוֹם *Edom*, but אֶדְוִמִי (*Edomite*), shortened at the beginning because the tone is thrown forward; אֶמֶת (*‘emēth*) *truth*, אֶמֶתוֹ *his truth*; נֶעְלָם *hidden*, pl. נֶעְלָמִים; הֶעֱבֵרְתִּי וְהֶעֱבַרְתִּי.
- x 6. To the chapter on vowel changes belongs lastly the *dissimilation* of vowels, i. e. the change of one vowel into another entirely heterogeneous, in order to prevent two similar, or at least closely related vowels, from following one another in the same word¹. Hence לֹלֵא for לֹלֵא *lō* (unless); the proper names יְהוּדָא and יִשְׁשַׁע stand most probably for *Yōhūdā*, *Yōshū‘ā* (= יְהוֹשֻׁעַ). Cf. also חִיצוֹן from חוּץ; רִאשׁוֹן from רִאשׁ; תִּיבּוֹן from תוֹב; עִירָם from עִיר, and the second foot-note on § 68. 1.

§ 28. *The Rise of New Vowels and Syllables.*

- a 1. According to § 26. 4 a half-syllable, i. e. a consonant with *Šewā*, (always weakened from a short vowel,) can only occur in close dependence on a full syllable. If another half-syllable with simple *Šewā* would follow, the former becomes again a full short vowel². This vowel is almost always *Hireq*. In most cases it is probably an attenuation of an original *ā*, and never a mere helping vowel. In some instances analogy may have led to the choice of the *ḥ*. Thus, according to § 102. 2, the prefixes כִּ, כְּ, לִ before a consonant with (ֿ) become כִּ, כְּ, לִ, e.g. לִפְרִי, כִּפְרִי, כְּפְרִי before פִּ; they are pointed as in בִּיהֻדָּה (from *bi-yhūdā*, according to § 24. b); so too with *Wāw* copulative, e.g. וַיְהֻדָּה for *wyḥūdā*. The first half-syllable, after the restoration of the short vowel, combines with the second to form a firmly closed syllable, e.g. לִנְפֹל Num. 14, 3 for *linphōl*, and so almost always in the infin. constr. after לִ (§ 45. g); in isolated cases also with כִּ, as כִּנְעָר Jer. 17, 2.
- b 2. Before a guttural with *Ḥaṭeph* the consonant of the half-syllable takes the short vowel contained in the *Ḥaṭeph*, and thus arise the

¹ Cf. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, p. xxix; A. Müller, *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken*, 1892, p. 177 sq.; with Nestle, *ibid.* p. 573 sq.

² *ḥ* and *i* is the only exception. It becomes *ḥ* before a simple *Šewā*, comp. § 104. e.

\wedge

1

 d

e

¹ In Judges 16, 13 read תארגי not (with Opatius, Hahn and others) תארגי.

² With a final ḥ, the only example is ḥḏḥ Prov. 30, 6, where several MSS. and printed editions incorrectly have ḥ without Dageš.

³ On the apparent exceptions נָחַץ, &c., comp. § 22. *c*; other instances in which נ has entirely lost its consonantal value, and is only retained orthographically, are נֶחֱם *sin*, נָחַץ *valley* (also נָחַץ), נָחַץ *vanity* (Job 15, 31 *K^o thibak נָחַץ*).

⁴ In this form (§ 65, 2) *Dageš lenē* remains in the final *Tāw*, although a vowel

vowels are of course always without the tone, and disappear before formative suffixes, e.g. *קִדְשִׁי* *my sanctuary*, *בֵּיתָא* *home-ward*.

- f* 5. On the rise of a full vowel in place of a simple *Šwā*, under the influence of the *pause*, see § 29. *m*; on initial *š* for *h*, see § 23. *h*.

§ 29. *The Tone, its Changes and the Pause.*

- a* 1. The principal tone rests, according to the Masoretic accentuation (comp. § 15. 2), as a rule on the final syllable¹, e.g. *דָּבָר, קָטָר, קָטָר, קָטָר, קָטָר, קָטָר*—in the last five examples on the formative additions to the stem. Less frequently it rests on the penultima, as in *לַיְלָה* *night*, *קָטָר, קָטָר, קָטָר*; but a closed penultima can only have the tone if the ultima is open (e.g. *קָטָר, קָטָר, קָטָר*), whilst a closed ultima can as a rule only be without the tone, if the penultima is open, e.g. *וָקָטָר, וָקָטָר*; compare also below, No. 3.
- b* A kind of counter tone or secondary stress, as opposed to the principal tone, is marked by *Metheg* (§ 16. 2). Words which are closely united by *Maqqeph* with the following word (§ 16. 1) can at the most have only a secondary tone.
- c* 2. The original tone of a word, however, frequently shifts its place in consequence either of changes in the word itself, or of its close connexion with other words. If the word is increased at the end, the tone is moved forward (*descendit*) one or two places according to the length of the addition, e.g. *דָּבָר* *word*, plur. *דְּבָרִים*; *דְּבָרֶיךָ* *your words*; *קִדְשִׁי* *sanctuary*, plur. *קִדְשֵׁי*; *קָטָר* with *קָטָר*. On the consequent vowel-changes, see § 27. 1, 3.
- d* 3. On the other hand, the original tone is shifted from the ultima to the penultima (*ascendit*):

(a) In many forms of the Imperfect, when *Wāw consecutive* (ו) see § 49. 2) is prefixed, e.g. *יֹאמַר* *he will say*, *וַיֹּאמַר* *and he said*; *יֵלֵךְ* *he will go*, *וַיֵּלֶךְ* *and he went*.

precedes, in order to point out that the helping *Pathah* is not to be regarded as a really full vowel, but merely as an orthographic indication of a very slight sound, to help the correct pronunciation. An analogous case is *יִלְחַד* *ylhdd* (from *חָדָה*, see § 75. *r*).

¹ This was not originally the case. Various linguistic phenomena tend to show that the principal tone originally rested as a rule on the penultima. See the proofs in Praetorius, *ZAW.*, 1883, p. 211 sqq., and Mayer Lambert, *Revue des études juives*, vol. xx, 1890, p. 73 sqq.; vol. xxv, 1892, p. 111 sq., and xxvi, p. 53.

(δ) For rhythmical reasons, when a monosyllable, or a word with the tone on the first syllable, follows a word with the tone on the ultima, in order to avoid the concurrence of two tone-syllables¹. This rhythmical retraction of the tone, however, (זסוג אחר, *receding*, as it is called by the Jewish grammarians,) is only admissible according to No. 1 above, provided that the penultima, which now receives the tone, is an open syllable, (with a long vowel; see however the Rem.,) whilst the ultima, which loses the tone, must be either an open syllable with a long vowel, e.g. פָּרָא לֵילָה Gen. 1, 5, 4, 17, 27, 25. Ex. 16, 29. Ps. 5, 11, 104, 14. Dan. 11, 13, or a closed syllable with a short vowel, e.g. חָאכַל לָחֶם Gen. 3, 19. Job 3, 3, 22, 28². The grave suffixes כֶּם-, לָן-, הֶם-, הֵן- are exceptions, as they never lose the tone.

Scarcely alone of the long vowels can remain in a closed ultima which *f* has lost the tone, but it then has, in correct editions, a retarding *Metheg* in order to prevent its being pronounced as *S'ghöl*, e.g. לִבְעֵר קֵץ Num. 24, 22; comp. Num. 17, 23. Jud. 20, 2. Is. 66, 3. Jer. 23, 29. Ezek. 22, 25. Ps. 37, 7. Prov. 1, 19. In other cases the shortening into *S'ghöl* does take place, e.g. הוֹלֵם פָּעַם *who smileth the anvil*, Is. 41, 7, for הוֹלֵם פָּעַם. The retraction of the tone even occurs when a half-syllable with a Šwâ mobile precedes the original tone-syllable, e.g. וַיִּאָּמְרוּ לוֹ Gen. 19, 5, and frequently; וַיִּרְדִּי בֹר Ps. 28, 1; וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ Ps. 31, 5; מִטְעֵי הָרֶבֶץ Is. 14, 19; as also when the tone-syllable of the second word is preceded by a half-syllable, e.g. לָקַח לָהּ Gen. 15, 7 (comp. § 20. c).

According to the above, it must be regarded as anomalous when the Masora *g* throws back the tone of a closed ultima upon a *virtually* sharpened syllable with a short vowel, e.g. אָחִיר בֵּן 1 Sam. 10, 5; וְכֹהֵשׁ בֹּן Job 8, 18, cf. Lev. 5, 22; לִדְרוֹק פֶּטֶן Gen. 39, 14, 17. Hos. 9, 2; whereas it elsewhere allows a closed penultima to bear the tone only when the ultima is open. Still more anomalous is the placing of the tone on a *really* sharpened syllable, when the ultima is closed, as in

¹ Even Hebrew *prose* proceeds, according to the accentuation, in a kind of Iambic rhythm. That this was intended by the marking of the tone, can be seen from the use of *Metheg*. Jos. Wijnkoop in *Darche hannesigah sive leges de accentus Hebraicae linguae ascensione*, Lugd. Bat. 1881, endeavours to explain, on euphonic and syntactical grounds, the numerous cases in which the usual retraction of the tone does not occur, e.g. וְבוֹרָא הַיָּדָה Is. 45, 7, where the object probably is to avoid a kind of hiatus; comp., however, Amos 4, 13.

² The reading עָרִיִּים (so even Opatius and Hahn) Ezek. 16, 7 for עָרִיִּים is rightly described by Baer as 'error turpis.'

על הַקֶּם 2 Sam. 23, 1 (comp. נִבְרָ שׁוּעַ Job 34, 19; יָבֹם־קֶן Gen. 4, 24, with Metheg of the secondary tone). We should read either הַקֶּם, or, with Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 167, and others, הֶקֶם. As abnormal forms, comp. further, בּוֹ יִחַן־קֶן Ex. 4, 4 and שָׁם יִהְיֶה־שָׁם Deut. 10, 5.

h (c) In *pause*, see No. 4.

The meeting of two tone-syllables (No. 3, δ) is avoided also by connecting the words with Maqqeph, in which case the first word entirely loses the tone, e. g. וַיִּכְתֹּב־שָׁם and *he wrote there*, Jos. 8, 32.

- i 4. Very essential changes of the tone and of the vowels are effected by the *pause*. By this term is meant the strong stress laid on the tone-syllable in the last word of a sentence (a verse) or clause. It is represented by a great *distinctive accent*, *Silluq*, 'Athndh, and in the accentuation of the books חַטָּא, 'Öl *wybrēd*. Apart from these principal pauses (*the great pause*), there are often pausal changes (*the lesser pause*), with the lesser distinctives, especially *S'golla*, *Zaqeph qaton*, *R'bhā*, and even with *Pašfa*, *Tiphha*, *Gereš*, and *Pazer*¹. The changes are as follows:

- k (a) When the tone-syllable naturally has a short vowel, it as a rule becomes tone-long in *pause*, e. g. קָטַל, קָטַל; מָיִם, מָיִם; קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ. An *ā* which has been modified to *S'ghöl* usually becomes *ā* in *pause*, e. g. קָשָׁר (ground-form *qašr*) in *pause* קָשָׁר 2 Ki. 11, 14; אָרָץ, אָרָץ Jer. 22, 29; also in 2 Ki. 4, 31 read קָשָׁב with ed. Mant, &c. (Baer קָשָׁב); דָּבָר becomes in *pause* דָּבָר.

- l Sometimes, however, the distinct and sharper *ā* is intentionally retained in *pause*, especially if the following consonant be doubled, e. g. יָרָח Job 4, 20, or ought to be doubled, e. g. בָּן Is. 8, 1, &c.; and even without the doubling, e. g. עַד Gen. 49, 27; וְהִקְרַעְשׁוּ 2 Chron. 29, 19 and regularly in the numeral אַרְבַּע *four*, Lev. 11, 20, &c. Compare the list of instances of pausal *ā* and *ē* in the Appendices to Baer's editions.

¹ In most cases, probably on account of a following guttural or *ā* (comp. e. g. Ex. 21, 31. Jer. 3, 9. Ruth 4, 4. Eccles. 11, 6; before יְ Jer. 17, 11). שָׁשֶׁם אָדָר 1 Sam. 7, 17, where *ā* has *munaḥ*, is very irregular, but the lengthening here is probably only to avoid the cacophony *šāphāḏ'ā*. In the same way הִצִּילָה Ezek. 17, 15 (with *Maḥpakh* before ה) and וַיִּקְרָא Ezek. 37, 8 (with *Darga* before ע) are to be explained. The four instances of אָרָץ for אָרָץ apparently require a different explanation; see § 32. c.—The theory of Olshausen and others that the phenomena of the *pause* are due *entirely* to liturgical considerations, i. e. that it is 'a convenient way of developing the musical value of the final accents by means of fuller forms' in divine service, is contradicted by the fact that similar phenomena are still to be observed in modern vulgar Arabic, where they can only be attributed to rhythmical reasons of a general character.

(b) When a full vowel in a tone-bearing final syllable has lost the tone before an affirmative, and has become *vocal S'wd*, it is restored in *pause* to its position as tone-vowel, and, if short, is lengthened, e.g. קָטַלָּה, *fem.* קָטַלָּה (*qāṭālā*), in *pause* קָטַלָּה (*qāṭālā*); שָׁמַעְתָּ *Sim'ā*, in *pause* שָׁמַעְתָּ (from sing. שָׁמַע); יָקַמְלוּ, יָקַמְלוּ, יָקַמְלוּ (sing. יָקַמְלָה). The fuller endings of the Imperfect וְ and וְ- (§ 47. *m* and *o*) alone retain the tone even when the original vowel is restored. In segholate forms, like לָחִי, פָּרִי (ground-form *lahy*, *pary*), the original *ā* returns, though under the form of a tone-bearing *S'ghōl*, thus לָחִי, פָּרִי; original *i* becomes *ē*, e.g. יָצִי, in *pause* יָצִי; original *ō* (*ū*) becomes *ō*, e.g. הָלִי (ground-form *huly*), in *pause* הָלִי (§ 93. *x*, *y*, *z*).

On the analogy of such forms as יָחִי, &c., the shortened Imperfects יָחִי and יָחִי become in *pause* יָחִי, יָחִי, because in the full forms יָחִי *he will be* and יָחִי *he will live* the *i* is attenuated from an original *ā*. We may also mention here שָׁכַם *the neck*, in *pause* שָׁכַם (ground-form *šakhm*), and the pron. אֲנִי *I*, in *pause* אֲנִי, as well as the restoration of the original *ā* as *ē* before the suffix תְּ- *thy, thee*, e.g. דְּבָרְךָ *thy word*, in *pause* דְּבָרְךָ; יִשְׁמְרֶךָ *he guards thee*, in *pause* יִשְׁמְרֶךָ; but after the prepositions בְּ, לְ, אֶת (את) the suffix תְּ- in *pause* becomes תְּ-, e.g. בְּךָ, לְךָ, אֵתְךָ.

(c) This tendency to draw back the tone in *pause* to the *penultima* ^o (as being the original tone-syllable?), shows itself also in such cases as אֲנִי *I*, in *pause* אֲנִי; אַתָּה *thou*, in *pause* אַתָּה (but in the three poetically accented Books also אַתָּה, since in those Books 'Athnah, especially after 'Ōl *w'yōbrēd*, has only the force of a *Zaqeph*; hence also יִפְלֵא *Prov.* 24, 4 instead of יִפְלֵא²; עַתָּה *now*, e.g. עַתָּה; and in other sporadic instances, like בָּלִי *Ps.* 37, 20 for בָּלִי: but in 1 Sam. 12, 25 Baer's reading תִּפְסַח is to be preferred to that of ed. Mant, &c.

(d) Conversely all forms of imperfects consecutive, whose final syllable, when not in *pause*, loses the tone and is pronounced with a short vowel, take, when in *pause*, the tone on the ultima with a tone-long vowel, e.g. וָיָמָת *and he died*, in *pause* וָיָמָת.

¹ Such a pausal syllable is sometimes further strengthened by doubling the following consonant, see § 20. *i*.

² יִפְלֵא *Ps.* 45, 6, comp. also יִפְלֵא *Ps.* 40, 15, is to be explained in the same way, but not יִפְלֵא *Zech.* 2, 11, where, on the analogy of הִשְׁמְרֶךָ *Jer.* 9, 3, we should expect יִפְלֵא.

- q Of other effects of the *pause* we have still to mention, (1) the transition of an \bar{e} (lengthened from \bar{e}) to the more distinct \bar{a} (see above, letter \bar{e}), e.g. הָתָו for הָתָו Is. 18, 5 (comp. § 67. v ; § 72. dd); קָטַל Is. 33, 9; אָצַל 1 Chron. 8, 38 (beside אָצַל [see v . 37. Cf. מָבֵאֵל Is. 7, 6 (מָבֵאֵל Ezr. 4, 7); : שָׁשֶׁר Jer. 22, 14; סָפֶר Ob. 20; : וְיִנְקָשׁ Ex. 31, 17; : וְיִאֲנָשׁ 2 Sam. 12, 15 (below, § 51. m)—S. R. D.); : חָפֶר Gen. 17, 14; : חָפֶר 1 Sam. 15, 23; : חָפֶר Ps. 40, 18; : חָפֶר Job 13, 21, &c., mostly before liquids or sibilants (but also הָשָׁב Is. 42, 22, and without the *pause* חָפֶר Lam. 3, 48). So also וְיִלָּךְ (shortened from וְיִלָּךְ) becomes in *pause* וְיִלָּךְ; compare וְיִלָּךְ Lam. 3, 2; : חָלָן for חָלָן Jud. 19, 20. On $S^g h\bar{o}l$ in *pause* instead of \bar{e} , comp. § 52. n , and especially § 75. n , on חָיָה Prov. 4, 4 and 7, 2.
- r (2) The transition from \bar{a} to \bar{e} in the ultima; so always in the formula לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד (for עֶד) for ever and ever.
- s (3) The *pausal Qameṣ* in *Hithpa'el* (but not in *Piel*) for \bar{e} , e.g. יִתְחַלֵּף Job 18, 8 for יִתְחַלֵּף. According to § 54. k , this *Qameṣ* is lengthened from an original \bar{a} .
- t (4) The restoration of a final *Yodh* which has been dropped from the stem, together with the preceding vowel, e.g. בָּעֵיז, בָּעֵיז Is. 21, 12, for בָּעֵיז, בָּעֵיז, the latter also without the *pause* Is. 56, 9, 12; comp. Job 12, 6, and the same occurrence even in the word before the *pause* Deut. 32, 37. Is. 21, 12.
- u (5) The transition from \bar{o} or \bar{e} to \bar{a} in *pause*: as שָׁאֵלָה Is. 7, 11, if it be a locative of שָׁאֵל, and not rather imperat. Qal of שָׁאֵל; שָׁכַלְתִּי Gen. 43, 14 for שָׁכַלְתִּי; : שָׁכַלְתִּי Gen. 49, 3; : שָׁכַלְתִּי Gen. 49, 27; perhaps also שָׁכַלְתִּי 1 Ki. 22, 34. Is. 59, 17, and מִשְׁכַּלְתִּי Is. 28, 17, comp. 2 Ki. 21, 13. On the other hand the regular pausal form יִחְפֹּץ, which is found as well as the ordinary Imperfect יִחְפֹּץ, must be referred to a Perfect יִחְפֹּץ (see § 47. h).
- v (6) When a *Pathah* both precedes and follows a virtually doubled guttural, the second becomes \bar{a} in *pause*, and the first $S^g h\bar{o}l$, according to § 22. c and § 27. g , e.g. אָחֵי my brothers, in *pause* אָחֵי; comp. יִחְנָחֵם Deut. 32, 36. Num. 8, 7. 23, 19. Ezek. 5, 13. Ps. 135, 14.—On pausal \bar{e} , for $S^g h\bar{o}l$, in infin., imperat., and imperf. of verbs לָה, see § 75. hh .

SECOND PART.

ETYMOLOGY, OR THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

§ 30. *Stems and Roots*¹: *Biliteral, Triliteral, and Quadriliteral.*

1. Stems in Hebrew, as in the other Semitic languages, have this ^a peculiarity, that by far the majority of them consist of three consonants. On these the meaning essentially depends, while the various modifications of the idea are expressed rather by changes in the vowels, e.g. עָמַק *he was deep*, עֶמֶק *deep*, עֲמֻקָּה *depth*, עֲמֻקָּה *a valley, plain*. Such a stem may be either a verb or a noun, and the language commonly exhibits both together, e.g. זָרַע *he has sown*, זֶרַע *seed*; חָכַם *he was wise*, חָכָם *a wise man*. For practical purposes, however, it has long been the custom to regard as the stem the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. Qal (see § 43), since it is one of the simplest forms of the verb, without any formative additions. Not only are the other forms of the verb referred to this stem, but also the noun-forms, and the large number of particles derived from nouns; e.g. צָדִיק *he was righteous*, צִדְקָה *righteousness*, צַדִּיק *righteous*, &c.

Sometimes the language, as we have it, exhibits only the verbal ^b stem without any corresponding noun-form, e.g. סָקַל *to stone*, נָהַג *to bray*; and on the other hand, the noun is sometimes without the corresponding verb, e.g. סֶלַע *stone*, נֶגֶב *south*. Since, however, the nominal or verbal stems, which are not now found in Hebrew, for the most part occur in one or more of the other Semitic dialects, it may be assumed, as a rule, that Hebrew, when a living language, also possessed them. Thus, in Arabic, the verbal stem 'ābinā (*to become compact, hard*) corresponds to סָקַל, and the verb n'gab (*to be dry, arid*) in Aramaic to נָהַג.

¹ On the questions discussed in this section compare the bibliography at the head of § 79.

- c Rem. 1. The Jewish grammarians call the stem (i.e. the 3rd pers. sing. Perf. Qal), שָׁלַח *root*. Hence it became customary among Christian grammarians to call the stem *radix*, and its three consonants *literae radicales*, in contradistinction to the *literae serviles* or *formative letters*. On the correct use of the term *root*, see letter g.
- d 2. Others regard the three stem-consonants as a *root*, in the sense that, considered as *vowelless* and unpronounceable, it represents the common foundation of the verbal and nominal stems developed from it, just as in the vegetable world, from which the figure is borrowed, stems grow from the hidden root, e.g.

Root: שָׁלַח, the indeterminate idea of *ruling*.

Verb-stem, שָׁלַח *he has reigned*.

Noun-stem, מֶלֶךְ *king*.

For the investigation of the actual condition of the language, however, this hypothesis of unpronounceable roots, with indeterminate meaning, is fruitless. Moreover, the term *root*, as it is generally understood by linguists, cannot be applied to the Semitic triliteral stem (see No. 2)¹.

- e 3. The 3rd sing. Perf. Qal, which, according to the above, is usually regarded, both lexicographically and grammatically, as the ground-form, is generally in Hebrew a dissyllable, e.g. שָׁלַח. The monosyllabic forms have only arisen through contraction (according to the traditional explanation), from stems which had a weak letter (י or ו) for their middle consonant, e.g. מָלַךְ from *qāwām*; or from stems whose second and third consonants are identical, e.g. מָלַךְ and מָלַךְ (compare, however, below, § 67). The dissyllabic forms have themselves no doubt arisen, through a loss of the final vowel, from trisyllables, e.g. מָלַךְ from *qāwālā*, as it is still in Arabic.
- f 2. The law of the triliteral stem is so strictly observed in the formation of verbs and nouns in Hebrew (and in the Semitic languages generally), that the language has sometimes adopted artificial methods to preserve at least an appearance of triliteralism in monosyllabic stems, e.g. מָלַךְ for מָלַךְ, in the Imperfect Qal of verbs מָלַךְ. Even such nouns, as אָב *father*, אִמָּה *mother*, אָח *brother*, which were formerly all regarded as original monosyllabic forms (*nomina primitiva*), may, in some cases at least, have arisen from mutilation of a triliteral stem.
- g On the other hand, a large number of triliteral stems really point to a biliteral base, which may be properly called a *root* (*radix primaria, biliteralis*), since it forms the starting-point for several triliteral modifications of the same fundamental idea. Though in themselves unpronounceable, these roots are usually pronounced with *ā* between the two consonants, and are represented in writing

¹ Compare Philippl, 'Der Grundstamm des starken Verbums im Semitischen und sein Verhältniss zur Wurzel,' in *Morgenländische Forschungen*, Leipz. 1875, pp. 69-106.

by the sign \checkmark , e.g. \checkmark as the root of בָּרַר , בָּרַח , בֹּרַח , אָבַר . The reduction of a stem to the underlying root may generally be accomplished with certainty when the stem exhibits one weak consonant with two strong ones, or when the second and third consonants are identical. Thus e.g. the stems דָּבַר , דָּבַח , דָּבַח , דָּבַח may all be traced to the idea of *striking, breaking*, and the root common to them all is evidently the two strong consonants דָּב (*dakh*). Very frequently, however, the extension of the root into a stem is effected by the addition of a strong consonant, especially, it seems, a sibilant, liquid or guttural. Finally, further modifications of the same root occur when either the consonants of the root, or the letter which has been added, changes into a kindred letter, according to the laws of sound-change (see the examples given below). Usually such a change in the sound is accompanied by a change in the shade of meaning.

Examples: from the root קץ (no doubt *onomatopoeitic*, or imitating a sound), which represents the fundamental idea of *carving off, cutting in pieces*, are derived immediately: קצץ and קצה *to cut, to cut off*; the latter metaph. *to decide, to judge* (whence קָצִין, Arab. *qaḏi*, a judge); also קָצַב *to cut off, to shear*, קָצַף *to tear, to break*, קָצַע *to cut into*, קָצַר *to cut off, to reap*. With a softer sibilant קש, קס, whence קָסַם *to cut off*, קָשַׁשׁ and קָשָׁה *to peel off, to rub off*. With a lingual instead of the sibilant, קט, קר, whence קָטַב *to cut in pieces, to destroy*, קָטַל *to cut down, to kill*, קָטַף *to tear off, to pluck off*, קָדַר *to cut in pieces, to cleave*. With the initial letter softened, the same root becomes כס, whence כָּסַח *to cut off*, and כָּסַם *to shave*; comp. also נכס Syr. *to slay (to sacrifice), to kill*. With the greatest softening נז and נד; נָזַז *to cut off, to shear*; נָזַה *to hew stone*; נָזַח, נָזַם, נָזַל, נָזַל *to cut off, to tear off, eat up*; similarly נָזַר *to cut into*, נָזַע *to cut off*; comp. also נָזַה, נָזַף, נָזַר. Allied to this root also is the series of stems which instead of a palatal begin with a guttural sound (ח), e.g. חָדַר *to split, cut*; comp. also חָטַב, חָזַח, חָזַץ, חָרַשׁ, חָדַר, חָרַק, חָרַל, חָסַב, חָסַל, חָסַף, חָסַף.

The root חם expresses the sound of *humming*, which is made with the mouth closed (מִשְׁמָח); hence חִסְמָה, חִסְמָה, חִסְמָה, חִסְמָה (חִסְמָה), Arab. *hāmhamā*, to buzz, to hum, to snarl, &c.

As developments from the root רע comp. the stems רעץ, רעל, רעם, רעץ, רעץ, רעץ, רעץ. Not less numerous are the developments of the root בר (פר) and many others.

On closer investigation of this subject the following observations suggest themselves:

(a) These roots are mere *abstractions* from stems in actual use, and are themselves not in use. They merely represent the hidden germs (*semina*) of the stems which appear in the language. Yet these stems are sometimes so short as to consist simply of the elements of the root itself, e.g. *DA* *to be finished*, *ḥ* *light*. The ascertaining of the root and its meaning, although in many ways very difficult and

sonants¹. They arise from an extension of the trilateral stem: (a) by addition of a fourth stem-consonant; (b) in some cases perhaps by composition and contraction of two trilateral stems, by which means even *quinquiliterals* are produced. Stem-forms which have arisen from the mere repetition of one or two of the three original stem-consonants, e.g. סָחַרְחַר from סָחַר, are usually not regarded as *quadriliterals*, but as *conjugalional* forms (§ 55); so also the few words which are formed with the prefix ש, as שָׁלַחַבַּח *flame* from לָחַב, corresponding to the Aramaic conjugation *Šaph'el*, שָׁלַחַב.

Rem. on (a) The letters *r* and *l*, especially, are inserted between the first and second radicals, e.g. בָּסַם, בָּרַסַם *to eat up*; שָׁבַט = שָׁרְבַט *sceptre*; חָלַץ *hot wind* from חָלַץ *to glow*. The insertion of an *r* is especially frequent in Syriac. Comp. Aram. עָרַל *to roll*, expanded from עָלַל (conjugation *Pa'el*, corresponding to the Hebrew *Pi'el*). In Latin there is a similar expansion of *fid*, *scid*, *tud*, *jug* into *findo*, *scindo*, *tundo*, *jungo*. At the end of words the expansion is principally made by *l* and *n*, e.g. גָּרַם *axe*, גָּרַם *orchard* (from גָּרַם), גָּרַם *corolla* (גָּרַם *cup*); comp. § 85. xi.

Rem. on (b) Forms such as חֲבַצְלֵת *frog*, חֲבַצְלֵת *meadow-saffron*, were long regarded as compounds, though the explanation of them all was uncertain. Many words of this class, which earlier scholars attempted to explain from Hebrew sources, have since proved to be *loan-words* (§ 1. i), and consequently drop out of the question.

4. A special class of formations, distinct from the fully developed stems of three or four consonants, are (a) the *Interjections* (§ 105), which, as being immediate imitations of natural sounds, are independent of the ordinary formative laws; (b) the *Pronouns*. Whether these are to be regarded as the mutilated remains of early developed stems, or as relics of a period of language when the formation of stems followed different laws, must remain undecided. At all events, the many peculiarities of their formation² require special treatment (§ 32 sqq.). On the other hand, most of the *particles* (adverbs, *prepositions*, conjunctions) seem to have arisen in Hebrew from fully developed stems, although in many instances, in consequence of extreme shortening, the underlying stem is no longer recognizable (see § 99 sqq.).

¹ In Hebrew they are comparatively rare, but more numerous in the other Semitic languages, especially in Ethiopic.

² Comp. Hupfeld, 'System der semitischen Demonstrativbildung und der damit zusammenhängenden Pronominal- und Partikelbildung,' in the *Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenl.*, vol. ii. pp. 124 sqq., 427 sqq.

§ 31. *Grammatical Structure.*

- a* 1. The formation of the parts of speech from the stems (derivation) and inflexion are effected in two ways: (*a*) internally by changes in the stem itself, particularly in its vowels; (*b*) externally by the addition of formative syllables before or after it. The expression of grammatical relations periphrastically by means of separate words (e.g. the comparative degree and some case-relations in Hebrew) belongs, not to etymology, but to syntax.
- b* The external method (letter (*b*)) of forming words, viz. by affixing formative syllables, which occurs e.g. in Egyptian, appears on the whole to be the more ancient. Yet other families of language, and particularly the Semitic, at a very early period had recourse also to the internal method, and during their youthful vigour widely developed their power of forming derivatives. But the continuous decay of this power in the later periods of language made syntactical circumlocution more and more necessary. The same process may be seen also e.g. in Greek (including modern Greek), and in Latin with its Romance offshoots.
- c* 2. Both methods of formation exist together in Hebrew. The internal mode of formation by means of vowel changes is tolerably extensive (קטל, קטל, קטל; קטל, קטל, &c.). This is accompanied in numerous cases by external formation also (הקטל, הקטל, נקטל, &c.), and even these formative additions again are subject to internal change, e.g. הקטל, הקטל. The addition of formative syllables occurs, as in almost all languages, chiefly in the formation of the persons of the verb, where the meaning of the affixed syllables is for the most part still perfectly clear (see §§ 44, 47). It is also employed to distinguish gender and number in the verb and noun. Of case-endings, on the contrary, only scanty traces remain in Hebrew (see § 90).

CHAPTER I.

THE PRONOUN.

§ 32. *The Personal Pronoun. The Separate Pronoun.*

1. The personal pronoun (as well as the pronoun generally) *a* belongs to the oldest and simplest elements of the language (§ 30. *s*). It should be considered *before* the verb, since it plays an important part in verbal inflexion (§§ 44, 47).

2. The independent principal forms of the personal pronoun serve *b* (like the Gk. *ἐγώ*, *σύ*, and the Lat. *ego*, *tu*, and their plurals) almost solely to emphasize the nominative-subject (see, however, § 135. 2). They are as follows:

Singular.	Plural.
1. Com. אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי; } אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי } I.	1. Com. אֲנֹכְךָ, in pause אֲנֹכְךָ } (נָכְךָ, in pause נָכְךָ), (אֲנוּ) } we.
2. { m. אַתָּה (אַתָּה), in pause אַתָּה or אַתָּה } f. אַתָּה (אַתָּה properly אַתָּה), } thou. in pause אַתָּה	2. { m. אַתֶּם f. אַתֶּנָּה (אַתֶּנָּה); אַתֶּן (אַתֶּן) } ye.
3. { m. הוּא he (if). f. הִיא she (if).	3. { m. הֵם (הֵם), הֵמָּה } f. הֵנָּה after prefixes הֵן, הֵן } they.

The forms enclosed in parentheses are the less common. A table of these pronouns with their shortened forms (*pronominal suffixes*) is given in Paradigm A at the end of this Grammar.

REMARKS.

I. *First Person.*

1. The form אֲנִי is less frequent than אֲנִי¹. The former occurs in Phoenician, *c*

¹ On the prevalence of אֲנִי in the earlier Books compare the statistics collected by Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 251 sqq., partly contested by Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, 1882, vol. xi. p. 222 sqq., (but cf. his *Introduction to the Old*

Moabite and Assyrian, but in no other of the kindred dialects¹; from the latter the suffixes are derived (§ 33). The *ð* most probably results from an obscuring of an original *a* (comp. Aram. אָנָה, Arab. 'ana). The pausal form אָנָה occurs not only with small disjunctive accents, but even with conjunctives; so always in אָנָה אֵל as *I live!* also Is. 49, 18 with *Munah*, Ps. 119, 25 with *Merkha* (which however has been altered from *Doh!*) and twice in Mal. 1, 6. In all these cases there is manifestly a disagreement between the vocalization already established and the special laws followed by the system of accentuation.

- d* 2. The formation of the plural in this and the other persons, exhibits a certain analogy with that of the noun, while at the same time (like the pronouns of other languages) it is characterized by many differences and peculiarities. The short form אָנָה (אָנָה) from which the suffix is derived occurs only in Jer. 42, 6 *K'ithbā*. The form אָנָה (comp. § 19. *h*) only in Ex. 16, 7. 8, Num. 32, 32, Lam. 3, 42; אָנָה in *pause*, Gen. 42, 11; in Arabic *adhamu* is the regular form. In the *Mišna* אָנָה (אָנָה) has altogether supplanted the longer forms.
- e* 3. The Pronoun of the 1st person only is, as a rule in languages, of the *common gender*, because the person who is present and speaking needs no further indication of gender, as does the 2nd person, who is addressed (in Greek, Latin, English, &c., this distinction is also lacking), and still more the 3rd person who is absent.

II. Second Person.

- f* 4. The forms of the 2nd person אָנָה, אָנָה, אָנָה, אָנָה, &c., are contracted from *anta*, &c. The kindred languages have retained the *n* before the א, e.g. Arab. 'anta, fem. 'anti, thou; pl. 'antum, fem. 'antunna, ye. In Syriac אָנָה, fem. אָנָה are written, but both are pronounced 'at. In Western Aramaic אָנָה is usual for both genders.
- g* אָנָה (without א) occurs five times, e.g. Ps. 6, 4, always as *K'ithbā*, with אָנָה as *Q'at*. In three places אָנָה appears as a masculine, Num. 11, 15. Deut. 5, 24. Ezek. 28, 14.
- h* The feminine form was originally אָנָה as in Syriac, Arabic and Ethiopic. This form is found seven times as *K'ithbā* (Jud. 17, 2. 1 Ki. 14, 2. 2 Ki. 4, 16. 23. 8, 1. Jer. 4, 30. Ezek. 36, 13) and appears also in the corresponding personal ending of verbs (see § 44. *f*) especially, and necessarily, before suffixes, as אָנָה אָנָה, § 59. 1, *c*; comp. also *l* as the ending of the 2nd fem. sing. of the Imperative and Imperfect. The final *l* was, however, gradually dropped in pronunciation, just as in Syriac (see above, letter *f*) it was eventually only written, not pronounced. The *l* therefore

Testament, p. 147, bottom, ed. 6, p. 155.) as well as by Delitzsch, *Genesis*, 1887, p. 28; fundamentally established by König in *Theologische Studien u. Kritik*, 1893, pp. 464 sqq. and 478, and in his *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 168, &c. In some of the latest Books (see the *Lexicon*) אָנָה is not found at all, and hardly at all in the Talmud.

¹ In Phoenician and Moabite (the inscription of *Mēša'*, line 1) it is written אָנָה, without the final א. In Punic it was pronounced *anec* (Plaut. *Poen.* 5, 1, 8) or *anech* (5, 2, 35). Comp. Schröder, *Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 143. In Assyrian the corresponding form is *anaku*, in ancient Egyptian *anek*, Coptic *anok*, *noh*.

finally disappeared, and hence the Masoretes, even in these seven passages, have pointed the word in the text as אֲנִי to indicate the *Qrē* אֲנִי (see § 17). The same final י appears in the rare (Aramaic) forms of the suffix אֲנִי , אֲנִי (§§ 58, 91).

5. The plurals אֲנִי and אֲנִי (אֲנִי), with the tone on the ultima (comp. § 29. a), *i* are obtuse forms (comp. § 27. v) from אֲנִי (Arab. *ʿantūm*, Aram. אֲנִי , אֲנִי) and אֲנִי or אֲנִי (Arab. *ʿantūnna*, Aram. אֲנִי , אֲנִי). Hence, no doubt, the fact, that the suffixes with the 2nd person plur. perf. are added to the termination אֲנִי , instead of אֲנִי , אֲנִי . The form אֲנִי is found only in Ezek. 34, 31 (so *Qimhī* expressly, others אֲנִי); אֲנִי (for which some MSS. have אֲנִי) only four times, viz. Gen. 31, 6. Ezek. 13, 11. 20. 34, 17; in 13, 20 אֲנִי (before a ד) is also used as feminine.

III. Third Person.

6. (a) In אֲנִי and אֲנִי (*hā* and *hī*) the א (corresponding to the *ʿElif of prolongation* in Arabic, comp. § 23. i) might have been added only as an orthographic closing of the final long vowel, as in אֲנִי , אֲנִי , &c. The א is, however, always written in the case of the separate pronouns¹, and only as a toneless suffix (§ 33. a) does אֲנִי appear as אֲנִי , while אֲנִי becomes אֲנִי . In Arabic (as in Syriac) they are written אֲנִי and אֲנִי but pronounced *hāwā* and *hīyā*, and in Vulgar Arabic even *hāwā* and *hīyyā*. This Arabic pronunciation alone would not indeed be decisive, since the vowel complement might have arisen from the more consonantal pronunciation of the א and י ; but the Ethiopic *weʿatā* (= *huʿa-tā*) for אֲנִי , *yeʿatā* (= *hiʿa-tā*) for אֲנִי (compare also the Assyrian *ya-u-a* for אֲנִי) shew that the א was original and indicated an early consonantal termination of the two words: comp. Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* xx. 459. According to Philippi (ibid. xxviii. 172 and xxix. 371 sqq.) אֲנִי arose from a primitive Semitic *ha-wa*, אֲנִי from *ha-ya*.

(b) The form אֲנִי also stands in the consonantal text (*K^othibh*) of the Pentateuch² (with the exception of eleven places) for the fem. אֲנִי . In all such cases the Masora, by the punctuation אֲנִי , has indicated the *Qrē* אֲנִי (*Qrē perpetuum*, see § 17). The common explanation regards this phenomenon as an archaism (similar to the epicene use of אֲנִי for *boy* and *girl*) which was incorrectly removed by the Masoretes. This assumption is, however, clearly untenable, if we consider (1) that no other Semitic language is without the quite indispensable distinction of gender in the separate pronoun of the 3rd pers.; (2) that this distinction does occur eleven times in the Pentateuch, and that in Gen. 20, 5. 38, 25. Num. 5, 13. 14 אֲנִי and אֲנִי are close to one another; (3) that outside the Pentateuch it is found throughout the oldest documents, so that the אֲנִי cannot be regarded as having been subsequently adopted from the Aramaic; (4) that those parts of the book of Joshua which certainly formed a constituent part of the original sources of the Pentateuch, know nothing of this epicene use of אֲנִי . Consequently there only

¹ In the inscription of King Mēša' (see § 2. 2), lines 6 and 27, we even find אֲנִי for אֲנִי ; and in the inscription of 'Ešmun'azar, line 22, for אֲנִי .

² Also in twelve places in the Babylonian Codex of 916 A.D.; comp. Baer, *Ezechiel*, p. 108 sq.; Buhl, *Kanon u. Text des A. T.* (Lpz. 1891), p. 243.

2. The *case* which these *suffixes* represent is—

b

(a) When joined to *verbs*, the *accusative* (comp., however, § 117. x), e.g. קָטַלְתִּירוּ I have killed *him*.

(b) When *affixed* to *substantives*, the *genitive* (like πατήρ μου, *pater eius*). They then serve as *possessive pronouns*, e.g. אָבִי ('ābh-ī) *my father*, סוּסוֹ *his horse*, which may be either *equus eius* or *equus suus*.

(c) When joined to *particles*, either the *genitive* or *accusative*, *d* according as the particles originally expressed the idea of a noun or a verb, e.g. בֵּינִי, literally *interstitium mei*, *between me* (comp. *mea causa*); but הִנְנִי *behold me*, *ecce me*.

(d) Where, according to the Indo-Germanic case-system, the dative *e* or ablative of the pronoun is required, the suffixes in Hebrew are joined to prepositions expressing those cases (ל sign of the dative, ב in, מן from, § 102), e.g. לוֹ *to him* (*ei*) and *to himself* (*sibi*), בּוֹ *in him*, מִנִּי (usually מִפְּנֵי) *from me*.

3. The suffixes of the 2nd person (ךָ, &c.) are all formed with *f* a *k*-sound, not, like the *separate* pronouns of the 2nd person, with a *t*-sound.

So in all the Semitic languages, in Ethiopic even in the verbal form (*qatalka*, *thou hast killed* = Hebr. קָטַלְתָּ).

4. The *suffix of the verb* (the accusative) and the *suffix of the noun* *g* (the genitive) are the same in most of their forms, but some differ, e.g. מֵי *me*, מִי *my*.

Paradigm A at the end of the Grammar gives a table of all the forms of the *separate pronoun* and the *suffixes*; a fuller treatment of the *verbal suffix* and the mode of attaching it to the verb will be found in § 58 sqq., of the *noun-suffix* in § 91, of the prepositions with suffixes in § 103, of adverbs with suffixes § 100. o.

§ 34. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

1. Sing. {^{m.} הֵן¹
f. הֵן (הֵן, הֵן)²} *this*. Plur. com. הֵנָּה (rarely הֵנָּה) *these*. a

¹ In many languages the demonstratives begin with a *d*-sound (hence called the *demonstrative sound*) which is, however, sometimes interchanged with a sibilant. Comp. Aram. הֵן, הֵן *masc.*, הֵן, הֵן *fem.* (*this*); Sansk. *sa, sâ, tat*; Gothic *sa, sô, thala*; Germ. *da, der, die, das*; and Eng. *the, this, that, &c.*

² That הֵן may stand for the feminine, cannot be proved either from Jud. 16, 28 or from the certainly corrupt passage in Jos. 2, 17.

- b* Rem. 1. The feminine form **זאת** has undoubtedly arisen from **זאת**, by obscuring of an original *d* for *ð* (for **זאת** = **זאת** comp. the Arab. *hā-dā*, *this*, masc.; for **זאת** as the feminine ending § 80), and the forms **זוה**, **זו**, both of which are rare¹, are shortened from **זאת**, by rejection of the **ת**. In Ps. 132, 12 **זו** is used as a *relative*, comp. **זו** below. In Jer. 26, 6, *K'athibh*, **הזאתה** (with the article and the demonstrative termination **הַ**) is found for **זאת**. The forms **זאתה** and **זאתה** are plurals of **זוה** and **זאת** by usage, not etymologically. The form **זאת** occurs only in the Pentateuch (but not in the Samaritan text), Gen. 19, 8. 25. 26, 3. 4, &c. [8 times], always with the article, **הזאת**, and in 1 Chron. 20, 8 without the article [cf. Driver on Deut. 4, 42]². Both the singular and the plural may refer to things as well as persons.
- c* 2. In combination with prepositions to denote the oblique case we find **לזוה** *to this* (comp. for **לזוה**, § 102. *g*), **לזאת**, **לזאת** *to this* (fem.), **לזאתה**, **לזאתה** *to these*; **זאתה** *hunc*, **זאתה** *hanc*, **זאתה** *hos*, also without **זאת**, even before the verb Ps. 75, 8 and elsewhere. Note also **זה** *pretium huius* (1 Ki. 21, 2), &c.
- d* 2. The secondary form **זו** occurs only in poetic style, and is used mostly for the relative, like our *that* for *who*. Like **זוה** (§ 36), it serves for all numbers and genders.
- e* Rem. 1. This pronoun takes the article (**הזוה**, **הזאת**, **הזאתה**, **הזאתה**) according to the same rule as adjectives, see § 126. 5; e.g. **הזוה** *this man*, but **זוה** *this is the man*.
- f* 2. Rarer secondary forms, with strengthened demonstrative force, are **הזוה** Gen. 24, 65. 37, 19; **הזוה** fem. Ezek. 36, 35, and shortened **הזוה**, sometimes masc., as in Jud. 6, 20. 1 Sam. 17, 26. 2 Ki. 23, 17. Zech. 2, 8. Dan. 8, 16, once fem., 2 Ki. 4, 25; cf. 1 Sam. 14, 1 [and 20, 19 LXX]. In Arabic the corresponding form *'alladhi* is the relative pronoun.
- g* 3. The personal pronouns of the 3rd person also often have a demonstrative sense, see § 136.

§ 35. The Article.

- a* 1. The article, which is by nature a kind of demonstrative pronoun, never appears in Hebrew as an independent word, but always in closest connexion with the word which is defined by it. It usually takes the form **הַ**, with a sharply pronounced *ā* and a doubling of the following consonant, e.g. **הַשֶּׁשֶׁשׁ** *the sun*, **הַיָּאֵר** *the river*, **הַלֵּוִיִּם** *the Levites* (according to § 20. *m* for **הַיָּאֵר**, **הַלֵּוִיִּם**).
- b* Rem. With regard to the *Dages* in **הַ** after the article, the rule is, that it is inserted when a **ו** or **ע** follows the **הַ**, e.g. **הַיְּהוּדִים** *the Jews*, **הַיְּעִנְסִים** *the weary*

¹ **זוה** 2 Ki. 6, 19, Ez. 40, 45, and Eccles. (6 times); **זו** only Hos. 7, 16, Ps. 132, 12.

² According to Kuenen (comp. above, § 2. *n*) the form **זאת** dates from a time when the vowel of the second syllable was not yet indicated by a vowel letter; later copyists accidentally omitted the addition of the **ת**.

(*פְּעֻנִים* Lam. 4, 3 *Q^{rt}* is an exception), but *הַיָּאֹר*, *הַיָּלִידִים*, *הַיָּסֹד*, &c. *Dageš forte* also stands after the article in the prefix *בְּ* in certain nouns and in the participles *Pi'il* and *Pu'al* (see § 52. c) before *ה*, *ע* and *ר*, except when the guttural has under it a short vowel in a sharpened syllable; thus *הַמַּחֲזִיק* Ezek. 22, 5, *הַמַּעֲרִיב* the cave (comp. Job 38, 40. 1 Chron. 4, 41); but *הַמַּחֲזִיק* Ps. 104, 3 (Eccles. 4, 15. 2 Chron. 23, 12; before *ע* Ps. 103, 4); *הַמַּעֲשֶׂה* Is. 23, 12. Before letters other than gutturals this *בְּ* remains without *Dageš*, according to § 20. m.

2. When the article stands before a guttural, which (according to § 22. 1) cannot properly be doubled, the following cases arise, according to the character of the guttural (compare § 27. g).

(1) In the case of the weakest guttural, *א*, and also with *ר* (§ 22. 1 and 5), the doubling is altogether lost. Consequently, the *Pathah* of the article (since it stands in an open syllable) is always lengthened to *Qameṣ*; e.g. *הָאָב* the father, *הָאֲחֵר* the other, *הָאִם* the mother, *הָאִישׁ* the man, *הָאוֹר* the light, *הָאֱלֹהִים* *ὁ θεός*, *הָרֶגֶל* the foot, *הָרָאשׁ* the head, *הָרָשָׁע* the wicked.

So also *הַשְּׂפֹת* Neh. 3, 13, because syncopated from *הַשְּׂפֹתֹת* (comp. verse 14 *d* and Baer on the passage); *הַמִּנִּים* (as in Num. 11, 4. Jud. 9, 41. 2 Sam. 23, 33, with the *א* orthographically retained, for *הַמִּין*) Jer. 40, 4 (comp. *בְּמִין* verse 1); *הַסִּירִים* Eccles. 4, 14 for *הַסִּירִים*; *הַרְמִים* 2 Chron. 22, 5 for *הַרְמִים* (comp. 2 Ki. 8, 28).

(2) In the case of the other gutturals there occurs either the virtual or weak doubling (§ 22. 1)—especially with the stronger sounds *ח* and *ה*, less often with *ע*—or the doubling is wholly omitted. In the former case, the *Pathah* of the article remains, because the syllable is still regarded as closed; in the second case, the *Pathah* is either slightly lengthened into *Sghól* or fully into *Qameṣ*. That is to say:—

(A) When the guttural has any other vowel than *ā* (*אָ*) or *ē* (*אֵ*), *f* then

(1) before the stronger sounds *ח* and *ה* the article regularly remains *הַ*; e.g. *הָרִאשׁ* that, *הַחֹדֶשׁ* the month, *הַחֵיל* the force, *הַחֲכִמָּה* the wisdom. Before *ח*, *ā* occurs only in *הַחֵי* Gen. 6, 19; *הַחֲרִיטִים* Is. 3, 22; *הַחֲמִנִים* Is. 17, 8; before *ה*, always in *הַחֲמָה*, *הַחֵם*, *הַחֲמָה*.

(2) before *ע* the *Pathah* is generally lengthened to *Qameṣ*, e.g. *הָעַיִן* the eye, *הָעִיר* the city, *הָעֶבֶד* the servant, plur. *הָעֶבְדִּים* 1 Ki. 12, 32; also in Gen. 10, 17 *הָעֶרְשִׁי* is the more correct reading. Exceptions are *הָעוֹפֹת* Exod. 15, 10; *הָעוֹרִים* 2 Sam. 5, 6. 8. Is. 42, 18; *הָעֶבֶד* Is. 24, 2; *הָעוֹרִים* Is. 65, 11; *הָעֶשֶׂן* Ezek. 22, 7; *הָעוֹרִים* Prov.

2, 13 and תְּעֹבֶה Prov. 2, 17; לְעֵינַי 1 Sam. 16, 7. Eccles. 11, 7; but לְעֵינִי Gen. 3, 6. Prov. 10, 26. Comp. Baer on Is. 42, 18.

h (B) When the guttural has \bar{a} (ֶ) then

(1) before a tone-bearing הּ or וּ the article is always הֶ, otherwise it is הָ; e.g. הָעָם *the people*, הָהָר *the mountain*, הָעֵין (in pause), הַהָרָה *towards the mountain*; but (according to § 22. c) הַהָרִים *the mountains*, הָעֵוֹן *the guilt*.

i (2) before הּ the article is invariably הֶ without regard to the tone; e.g. הַחָכָם *the wise man*, הַחֲגִי *the festival*.

k (3) When the guttural has ֿ the article is הֶ before הּ, e.g. הַחֳדָשִׁים *the months*; בְּתִרְבוֹת *in the waste places* (without the article בְּתִרְבוֹת) Ezek. 33, 27, comp. 2 Chron. 27, 4; but הֶ before וּ, as הַמְּקָרִים *the sheaves* Ruth 2, 15.

The gender and number of the noun have no influence on the form of the article.

Xi Rem. 1. The original form of the Hebrew (and the Phoenician) article הֶ is generally considered to have been הָל, the ל of which (owing to the proclitic nature of the article) has been invariably assimilated to the following consonant, as in יִשְׂרָאֵל from יִשְׂרָאֵל, § 19. d. This view is certainly supported by the form of the Arabic article هـ (pronounced *hal*¹ by some modern Bedāwī, see Wallin in the *ZDMG*. vi. 195, 217), the ל of which is also assimilated at least before all letters like *s* and *t* and before *l*, *n*, and *r*, e.g. 'al-Qur'ān but 'as-sānā (Bed. *has-sana*) = Hebr. הַשָּׁנָה *the year*. It is, however, a question whether the Hebr. הֶ is not distinct from the Arab. 'al, and whether the sharpening of the following consonant should not be explained in the same way as the sharpening of the consonant after י consecutive (§ 49. f; comp. also cases like בְּמָה, בְּמָה, &c., § 102. k).

m The Arabic article itself perhaps occurs in the Old Testament in אֶלְמָנִים 1 Ki. 10, 11. 12 (also אֶלְמָנִים 2 Chron. 2, 7. 9, 10. 11), probably *sandal-wood*, also in אֶלְגֵּיִשׁ *hail, ice* = גֵּיִשׁ (Arab. *gibs*) Ezek. 13, 11. 13. 38, 22. On the other hand, in the proper name אֶלְמֶדֶד Gen. 10, 26 the first syllable may perhaps be אֶל *God*, as D. H. Müller (comp. Gesenius' *Lexicon*, 11th ed. s.v.) and Nöldeke (*Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.* 1882, p. 1186) suppose. אֶלְקָיִם Prov. 30, 31, commonly explained as = Arab. *alqaum*, the militia, is quite uncertain.

n 2. When the prefixes הֶ, הָ, הֵ (§ 102) come before the article, the הֶ is syncopated, and its vowel is thrown back to the prefix, in the place of the Šwā (§ 19. k, and

¹ In the Lihyanitic inscriptions collected by Euting (ed. by D. H. Müller in *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Arabien*, Wien, 1889) the article is הֶ, before gutturals הַן (*han*). The Dageš forte in Hebrew would then be due to assimilation of a ה. This is the opinion of Halévy (*Revue des études juives*, xxiii. p. 117), while D. H. Müller regards the five forms in dispute as participles Niph'al.

§ 37.] *The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns.* 113

§ 23. *h*), e.g. בְּשָׁמַיִם in the heaven for בְּהַשְׁמַיִם (so Ps. 36, 6); לָעָם for לְהָעָם to the people, בְּהָרִים on the mountains, בְּחֳדָשִׁים in the months¹. Exceptions to this rule occur almost exclusively in the later Books: Ezek. 40, 25, 47, 22, Eccles. 8, 1. Dan. 8, 16. Neh. 9, 19, 12, 38. 2 Chron. 10, 7, 25, 10, 29, 27; comp., however, 1 Sam. 13, 21. 2 Sam. 21, 20. Elsewhere, e.g. 2 Ki. 7, 12, the Masora requires the syncope in the *Qrā*. A distinction in meaning is observed between בְּהַיּוֹם about this time (Gen. 39, 11. 1 Sam. 9, 13, &c.) and בְּיוֹם first of all (Gen. 25, 31, &c.). After the copula ו (and) syncope of the ה does not take place, e.g. הָעָם וְהָאָרֶץ.

3. The words אֶרֶץ earth, הָר mountain, חֵן feast, עַם people, בָּר bull, always appear after the article with a long vowel (as in *pause*); הָאָרֶץ, הָהָר, הָחֵן, הָעָם, הָבָר; compare also אֶרֶן ark, with the article always הָאֶרֶן.

§ 36. *The Relative Pronoun.*

The relative pronoun (cf. § 138) is usually the indeclinable אֲשֶׁר (*who, which, &c.*), originally a demonstrative pronoun; see further §§ 138 and 155. In the later Books, especially Eccles. and late Psalms,—also Lam. (4 times), Jon. (3 times), Chron. (twice), Ezra (once),—and always in Canticles (cf. Jud. 6, 17, 7, 12, 8, 26. 2 Ki. 6, 11;—Gen. 6, 3. Job 19, 29 are both doubtful), אֲשֶׁר is used instead; more rarely אֲשֶׁר Jud. 5, 7. Cant. 1, 7 (Job 19, 29?); once אֲשֶׁר before א Jud. 6, 17 (elsewhere before a guttural אֲשֶׁר), before ה even אֲשֶׁר Eccles. 3, 18, and according to some (e.g. Qimhi) also in Eccles. 2, 22².

§ 37. *The Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns.*

1. The interrogative pronoun is מִי *who?* (of persons, even before a plurals, Gen. 33, 5. Is. 60, 8. 2 Ki. 18, 35; comp. also מִי בְּתָרִי whose daughter? Gen. 24, 23; מִי לְ to whom? מִי אֶת־מִי whom?) and מַה *what?* (of things).

The form מִי, מַה, &c. (followed by *Dageš forte conjunct.*: even in מִי, Hab. 2, 1, &c. *b* against § 20. *m*) may be explained from the rapid utterance of the interrogative in connexion with the following word. Most probably, however, the *Dageš forte* is rather due to the assimilation of an originally audible ה (מִה, as Olshausen), which goes back through the intermediate forms *math*, *mat* to an original *mant*: so W. Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Cambridge, 1890, p. 124, partly following Böttcher, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 261. Socin calls

¹ Also in Is. 41, 2, read מִשְׁמַיִם instead of the impossible מִשְׁמַיִם.

² The full form אֲשֶׁר does not occur in Phœnician, but only אֲשֶׁ (= אֲשֶׁ?), pronounced *asse*, *esse* (also *as*, *es*, *is*, *ys*, *us*), or—especially in the later Punic and in the *Pœnulus* of Plautus—*u* (*sa*, *si*, *sy*, *su*). Also in New Hebrew אֲשֶׁ is the common form. Cf. Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 162 sqq. and below, § 155.

attention to the Arabic *mah* (in pause with an audible *h*: *Mafassal*, 193, 8). Observe further that—

- c* (a) In the closest connexion, by means of *Maqqeph*, ׀ stands with a following *Dageš* (§ 20. d), e.g. ׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ *what is it to thee?* and even in *one* word, as ׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ *what is it to you?* Is. 3, 15; comp. Ex. 4, 2. Mal. 1, 13, and even before a guttural, as ׀ָ׀ָ׀ָ Ezek. 8, 6 *K'ithbāh*.
- d* (b) Before gutturals in close connexion, by means of *Maqqeph* or a conjunctive accent, it is either ׀ָ with a virtual doubling of the guttural (§ 22. c), so especially before ׀, and, in Gen. 31, 36. Job 21, 21, before ׀, or the doubling is wholly omitted. In the latter case either *ā* is fully lengthened to *Qameš* (comp. § 35. 2)—so always before ׀ and ׀—or half-lengthened to *S'ghōl*, especially before ׀, ׀, ׀ (before ׀ however also ׀ָ). The omission of the doubling also takes place as a rule with the hard gutturals, when they have not *Qameš*, and then the form is either ׀ָ or ׀ָ, the latter especially before ׀ or ׀, when *Maqqeph* follows.
- e* The longer forms ׀ָ׀ and ׀ָ׀ also remain before letters which are not gutturals, if they are not connected by *Maqqeph* but only by a *conjunctive accent*. As a rule ׀ָ׀ is then used, but ׀ָ׀ when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, Is. 1, 5. Ps. 4, 3 (on ׀ָ׀ in the combinations ׀ָ׀׀, ׀ָ׀׀, and even ׀ָ׀׀), 1 Sam. 1, 8, comp. § 102. *k* and *l*).
- f* (c) In the principal pause ׀ָ is used without exception; also as a rule with the smaller *disjunctives*, and especially almost always before gutturals (׀ָ only in very few cases). On the other hand, ׀ָ more often stands before letters which are not gutturals, when at a greater distance from the principal tone of the sentence, e.g. 1 Sam. 4, 6. 15, 14. 2 Ki. 1, 7. Hag. 1, 9 (see Köhler on the passage). Ps. 10, 13. Job 7, 21; comp., however, Prov. 31, 2, and Delitzsch on the passage.
- g* 2. On ׀ and ׀ as indefinite pronouns in the sense of *quicunque*, *quodcunque*, and as relatives, *is qui*, *id quod*, &c., see the *Lexicon*.

CHAPTER II.

THE VERB¹.§ 38. *General View.*

Verbal stems are either original or derived. They are usually *a* divided into—

(a) Verbal stems proper (*primitive verbs*), which exhibit the stem without any addition, e.g. מָלַךְ *he has reigned*.

(b) *Verbal derivatives*, i.e. *secondary* verbal stems, derived from the *b* pure stem (letter *a*), e.g. קִדְּשׁ *to sanctify*, הִתְקַדְּשׁ *to sanctify oneself*, from קִדְּשׁ *to be holy*. These are usually called *conjugations* (§ 39).

(c) *Denominatives*, i.e. verbs derived from nouns (like the Latin *c* *causari*, *praedari*, and Eng. *to skin*, *to poll*), either in a primitive or derivative form, e.g. אָהַל, *Qal* and *Pi'el*, *to pitch a tent*, from אֹהֶל *tent*; הִשְׁרִישׁ and שָׁרַשׁ *to take root*, and שָׁרַשׁ *to root out*, from שֹׁרֵשׁ *root* (§ 52. *h*).

This does not exclude the possibility that, for nouns, from which denominative *d* verbs are derived, the corresponding (original) verbal stem may still be found either in Hebrew or in the dialects. The meaning, however, is sufficient to show that the denominatives have come from the noun, not from the verbal stem, e.g. לָבֵן *a brick* (verbal stem לָבַן *to be white*), denomin. לָבַן *to make bricks*; דָּג *a fish* (verbal stem דָּגַן *to be prolific*), denomin. דָּג *to fish*; חֵרֵף *to winter* (from חֹרֵף *autumn, winter*, stem חָרַף *to pluck*); קָיַץ *to pass the summer* (from קַיִץ *summer*, stem קָיַץ *to be hot*).

§ 39. *Ground-form and Derived Stems.*

1. The 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect* in the form of the pure stem *a* (i.e. in *Qal*, see No. 4) is generally regarded, lexicographically and grammatically, as the fundamental or *ground-form* of the verb (§ 30. *a*), e.g. קָטַל *he has killed*, כָּבֵד *he was heavy*, קָטַן *he was little*². From

¹ Comp. M. Schultze, *Zur Formenlehre des semit. Verbs*, Vienna, 1886.

² For the sake of brevity, however, the meaning in Hebrew-English Lexicons is usually given in the Infinitive, e.g. לָמַד *to learn*, properly *he has learnt*.

this form the other persons of the *Perfect* are derived, and the *Participle* also is connected with it. קָטַל or קָטֵל, like the Imperative and Infinitive construct in sound, may also be regarded as an alternative ground-form, with which the Imperfect (see § 47) is connected.

b In verbs יָצַי (i.e. with י for their second radical) the stem-form, given both in *Lexicon* and *Grammar*, is not the 3rd sing. masc. Perfect (consisting of two consonants), but the form with medial י, which appears in the Imperative and Infinitive; e.g. שָׁב to return (3rd pers. perf. שָׁב): the same is the case in most stems with medial י, e.g. יָדַי to judge.

c 2. From the pure stem, or *Qal*, the derivative stems are formed according to an unvarying analogy, in which the idea of the stem assumes the most varied shades of meaning, according to the changes in its form (intensive, frequentative, privative, causative, reflexive, reciprocal; some of them with corresponding passive forms), e.g. לָמַד to learn, לָמַד to teach; שָׁכַב to lie, הִשְׁכִּיב to lay; שָׁפַט to judge, נִלְשָׁם to contend. In other languages such formations are regarded as new or *derivative* verbs, e.g. Germ. *fallen* (to fall), *fallen* (to fell); *trinken* (to drink), *tränken* (to drench); Lat. *lactere* (to suck, Germ. *saugen*), *lactare* (to give suck, Germ. *säugen*); *iacere* (to throw), *iacere* (to lie down); ἵκναι, ἵκναι. In Hebrew, however, these formations, which are incomparably more regular and systematic than (e.g.) in Greek, Latin, or English, are usually called, since the time of Reuchlin, *conjugations* (among the Jewish grammarians בִּינְיָיִם, i.e. *formations*, or more correctly *species*) of the primitive form, and are always treated together in the grammar and lexicon¹.

d 3. The changes in the primitive form consist either in internal modification by means of vowel-change and doubling of the middle consonant (קָטַל, קָטַל; קָטַל, קָטַל; comp. to lie, to lay; to fall, to fell), or in the repetition of one or two of the stem-consonants (קָטַל, קָטַל), or finally in the introduction of formative additions (קָטַל, קָטַל), which may also be accompanied by internal change (קָטַל, קָטַל). Comp. § 31. *b*.

In Aramaic the formation of the conjugations is effected rather by formative additions than by vowel-change. The vocalic distinctions have mostly become obsolete, so that, e.g. the reflexives with the prefix הָתָּ, אָתָּ, אֵתָּ have entirely usurped the place of the Passives. On the other hand, Arabic has preserved great

¹ The term *Conjugation* in Hebrew accordingly differs entirely from its meaning in Greek and Latin grammar.

wealth in both methods of formation, while Hebrew in this, as in other respects, holds the middle place (§ 1. 6).

4. Grammarians differ as to the *number* and *arrangement* of these *e* conjugations. The common practice, however, of calling them by the old grammatical terms, prevents any misunderstanding. The simple form is called *Qal* (קָל *light*, because it has no formative additions); the others (כְּבִירִים *heavy*, being weighted, as it were, with the strengthening of consonants or formative additions) take their names from the paradigm of עָשָׂה *he has done*¹, which was used in the oldest Jewish grammatical works. Several of these have passives which are distinguished from their actives by more obscure vowels. The common conjugations (including *Qal* and the passives) are the seven following, but only very few verbs exhibit them all :

<i>Active.</i>		<i>Passive.</i>	
1. Qal	קָטַל <i>to kill.</i>	(Comp. § 52. e.)	<i>f</i>
2. Niph'al	נִקְטַל <i>to kill oneself</i> (rarely passive).		
3. P'el	קָטַל <i>to kill many, to massacre.</i>	4. Pu'al	קֻטַּל.
5. Hiph'il	הִקְטִיל <i>to cause to kill.</i>	6. Hoph'al	הִקְטַל.
7. Hiithpa'el	הִתְקַטַּל <i>to kill oneself.</i> [Very rare, Hothpa'al הוּתְקַטַּל.]		

There are besides several less frequent conjugations, some of which, *g* however, are more common in the kindred languages, and even in Hebrew (in the weak verb) regularly take the place of the usual conjugations (§ 55).

¹ This paradigm was borrowed from the Arabic grammarians, and, according to Bacher, probably first adopted throughout by Abulwalīd. It was, however, unsuitable on account of the guttural, and was, therefore, usually exchanged in later times for קָטַל, after the example of Moses Qimḥi. This verb has the advantage, that all its conjugations are actually found in the Old Testament. On the other hand, it has the disadvantage of indistinctness in the pronunciation of some of its forms, e.g. הִקְטִיל, הִקְטַל. The paradigm of קָטַל, commonly used since the time of Danz, avoids this defect, and is especially adapted for the comparative treatment of the Semitic dialects, inasmuch as it is found with slight change (Arab. and Ethiop. קָטַל) in all of them. It is true that in Hebrew it occurs only three times in *Qal*, and even then only in poetic style (Ps. 139, 19. Job 13, 15. 24, 14); yet it is worth retaining as a model which has been sanctioned by usage. More serious is the defect, that a number of forms of the paradigm of קָטַל leave the beginner in doubt as to whether or not there should be a *Dageš* in the *B'gadh'phath* letters, and consequently as to the correct division of the syllables.

In Arabic there is a greater variety of conjugations, and their arrangement is more appropriate. According to the Arabic method, the Hebrew conjugations would stand thus: 1. *Qal*; 2. *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*; 3. *Po'el* and *Po'al* (see § 55. *b*); 4. *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*; 5. *Hithpa'el* and *Hothpa'al*; 6. *Hithpa'el* (see § 55. *b*); 7. *Niph'al*; 8. *Hithpa'el* (see § 54. *l*); 9. *Pi'el* (see § 55. *d*). A more satisfactory division would be into three classes: (1) The intensive *Pi'el* with the derived and analogous forms *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*. (2) The causative *Hiph'il* with its passive *Hoph'al*, and the analogous forms (*Šaph'el* and *Tiph'el*). (3) The reflexive or passive *Niph'al*.

§ 40. Tenses. Moods. Flexion.

- a* 1. While the Hebrew verb, owing to these derivative forms or conjugations, possesses a certain richness and copiousness, it is, on the other hand, poor in the matter of tenses and moods. The verb has only two tense-forms (*Perfect* and *Imperfect*, see the note on § 47. *a*), besides an *Imperative* (but only in the active), two *Infinitives* and a *Participle*. All relations of time, absolute and relative, are expressed either by these forms (hence a certain diversity in their meaning, § 106 sqq.), or by syntactical combinations. Of moods properly so called (besides the *Imperfect* and *Imperative*), only the *Jussive* and *Optative* are sometimes indicated by express modifications of the Imperfect-form (§ 48).
- b* 2. The inflexion of the *Perfect* and *Imperfect* as to persons, differs from that of the Western languages in having, to a great extent, distinct forms for the two genders, which correspond to the different forms of the personal pronoun. It is from the union of the pronoun with the verbal stem that the personal inflexions of these tenses arise.
- c* The following Table will serve for the beginner as a provisional scheme of the formative syllables (*affirmatives* and *preformatives*) of the two tenses. The three stem-consonants of the strong verb are denoted by dots. Compare § 44 sqq. and the Paradigms.

PERFECT.

Singular.			Plural.		
3. <i>m.</i>	.	.	3. <i>c.</i>	י	.
3. <i>f.</i>	נָ	.			.
2. <i>m.</i>	מָ	.	2. <i>m.</i>	דָּ	.
2. <i>f.</i>	מִ	.	2. <i>f.</i>	מִ	.
1. <i>c.</i>	יָ	.	1. <i>c.</i>	וּ	.

IMPERFECT.

Singular.					Plural.				
3. m.	.	.	.	י	3. m.	י	.	.	י
3. f.	.	.	.	א	3. f.	א	.	.	א
2. m.	.	.	.	א	2. m.	י	.	.	א
2. f.	י	.	.	א	2. f.	א	.	.	א
1. c.	.	.	.	א	1. c.	.	.	.	א

§ 41. Variations from the Ordinary Form of the Strong Verb.

The same laws which are normally exhibited in stems with strong *a* (unchangeable) consonants, hold good for all other verbs; and deviations from the model of the strong verb are only modifications occasioned by the special character or weakness of certain consonants, viz.:—

(a) When one of the stem-consonants (or radicals) is a guttural. In this case, however, the variations only occur in the vocalization (according to § 22), not in the consonants. The *guttural verbs* (§§ 62–65) are, therefore, only a variety of the *strong verb*.

(b) When a stem-consonant (*radical*) disappears by assimilation *b* (§ 19. 2), or when the stem originally consisted of only two consonants (*verbs* י"ד, ע"ע, and י"ע, as ע"ע, ע"ע, ע"ע, §§ 66, 67, 72).

(c) When one of the stem-consonants (*radicals*) is a weak letter. *c* In this case, through aphaeresis, elision, &c., of the weak consonant, various deviations from the regular form occur. Comp. § 68 sqq. for these 'quiescent' verbs, such as ע"ע, ע"ע, ע"ע.

Taking the old paradigm ע"ע as a model, it is usual, following the example *d* of the Jewish grammarians, to call the first radical of any stem ע, the second ע, and the third ע. Hence the expressions, *verb* ע"ע for a verb whose first radical is ע (*primae radicalis*, [*sc. literae*] ע); ע"ע for *mediae radicalis* ע; ע"ע for a verb whose second radical is repeated so as to form a third.

I. The Strong Verb.

§ 42.

As the formation of the strong verb is the model also for the weak verb, a statement of the general formative laws should precede the treatment of special cases.

Paradigm B, together with the Table of the personal preformatives and affirmatives given in § 40. c, offers a complete survey of the normal forms. A full explanation of them is given in the following sections (§§ 43–55), where each point is elucidated on its first occurrence; thus e.g. the inflexion of the Perfect, the Imperfect and its modifications, will be found under Qal, &c.

A. THE PURE STEM, OR QAL.

§ 43. Its Form and Meaning.

- a* The common form of the 3rd sing. masc. of the *Perfect Qal* is קָטַל, with *ä* (*Pathah*) in the second syllable, especially in *transitive* verbs (but see § 44. *c*). There is also a form with *ē* (*Sere*, originally *i*), and another with *ō* (*Holem*, originally *u*) in the second syllable, both of which, however, have almost always an *intransitive*¹ meaning, and serve to express states and qualities, e.g. כָּבֵד to be heavy, קָטַן to be small.

In Paradigm B a verb *middle A*, a verb *middle E*, and a verb *middle O* are accordingly given side by side. The second example קָבַד is chosen as showing, at the same time, when the *Dageš lenē* is to be inserted or omitted.

- b* Rem. 1. The vowel of the second syllable is the principal vowel, and hence on it depends the distinction between the transitive and intransitive meaning. The *Qameṣ* of the first syllable is lengthened from an original *ä* (comp. in Arabic *qātūlā*), but it can be retained in Hebrew only immediately before the tone, or at the most (with an open ultima) in the counter-tone with *Metheg*; otherwise, like all the pretonic vowels (*ä, ē*), it becomes vocal *Šwā*, e.g. קָטַלְתָּם and plur. masc. In the Aramaic dialects the vowel of the first syllable is always reduced to *Šwā*, as קָטַל = Hebr. קָטַל. The intransitive forms are pronounced in Arabic as *qātūlā*, *qātūllā*; in Hebrew (after the rejection of the final vowel) *i* in the tone-syllable has been regularly lengthened to *ē*, and *u* to *ō*.
- c* 2. Examples of *denominatives* in *Qal* are: חָפַץ to cover with pitch, from חָפֶץ pitch; מָלַח to salt, from מֶלַח salt; שָׁבַר (usually *Hiph.*) to buy or sell corn, from שֶׁבֶר corn; see above, § 38. *c*.

§ 44. Flexion of the Perfect of Qal².

- a* 1. The formation of the persons of the Perfect is effected by the addition of certain forms of the personal pronoun, and marks of the 3rd fem. sing. and 3rd pl. (as *affirmatives*) to the end of the verbal-stem, which contains the idea of a predicate, and may be regarded, in meaning if not in form, as a *Participle* or *verbal adjective*³. For the 3rd pers. sing. masc. *Perfect*, the pronominal or subject idea inherent in the

¹ But comp. such instances as Jer. 48, 5. In Arabic also, transitive verbs are found with middle *i*, corresponding to Hebrew verbs with *ē* in the second syllable. Hence P. Haupt (*Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1894, p. ci. sq.) prefers to distinguish them as *verba voluntaria* and *involuntaria*.

² Comp. Nöldeke, 'Die Endungen des Perfects' (*Untersuchungen zur semit. Gramm. II.*) in *ZDMG.*, vol. 38, p. 407 sqq.

³ On the connexion between the *Perfect* and the *verbal adjective* see §§ 39. *a*, 50. *b*. In intransitive verbs they both have exactly the same form, e.g. מָלֵךְ he was full and full; קָטַן he was small and small. In transitive verbs the participle has

finite verb is sufficient: thus, *הָרַגְתָּ* *he has killed*, *הָרַגְתָּ* *thou hast killed* (as it were, *killing thou*, or *a killer thou*), *הָרַגְתָּ* *a killer wast thou*=*הָרַגְתָּ*; *יָרָא* *he was fearing*, *יָרָאוּ* *ye were fearing*=*יָרָאוּ*. The ending of the 1st pers. plur. (וּ—) is just as certainly to be connected with the termination of *אֲנִי*, *אֵנָּה* *we*. The affirmative of the 1st pers. sing. (אֲ) is to be referred, by an interchange of כ and ת (cf. § 33. f), to that form of the pronoun which also underlies *אֲנִי*, I¹. In the *third* person הִ— (originally הִ—, comp. below, letter f) is a mark of the feminine, as in a great number of nouns (§ 80. c), and ו is the termination of the plural; comp., for the latter, the termination of the 3rd and 2nd pers. plur. Imperf. *ana* in Arabic and *u* (often also ו) in Hebrew, also *ana* (in the construct state *u*) as the termination of the masc. plur. of nouns in literary Arabic.

2. The characteristic *Pathah* of the second syllable becomes *Šwā* ^δ before an affirmative beginning with a vowel, where it would otherwise stand in an open syllable (as *הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*; but in *pause* *הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*). Before an affirmative beginning with a consonant the *Pathah* remains, whether in the tone-syllable (*הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*; in *pause* *הָרַגְתָּ* &c.) or before it. In the latter case, however, the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable, being no longer a pretonic vowel, becomes vocal *Šwā*; as *הָרַגְתָּ*, *הָרַגְתָּ*; comp. § 27. i and § 43. δ. On the retention of *a* with *Metheg* of the counter tone in the Perf. consecutive, comp. § 49. i.

Rem. 1. Verbs *middle E* in Hebrew (as in Ethiopic, but not in Arabic or Aramaic) generally change the *E*-sound in their inflexion into *Pathah* (frequently so even in the 3rd sing. masc. Perf.). This tendency to assimilate to the more common verbs *middle A* may also be explained from the laws of vocalization of the tone-bearing closed penultima, which does not readily admit of *Sere*, and never of a *Hireq*, of which the *Sere* is a lengthening (comp. § 26. p). On the other hand, *Sere* is retained in an open syllable; regularly so in the weak stems *לֵא* (§ 74. g), before suffixes (§ 59. i), and in the pausal forms of the strong stem in an open tone-syllable, e.g. *הָרַגְתָּ* *it cleaveth*, Job 29, 10 (not *הָרַגְתָּ*), comp. i Sam. 1, 23. Job 41, 15; even (contrary to § 29. g) in a closed pausal syllable, e.g. *שָׁבַן*, Deut. 33, 12 (out of pause *שָׁבַן*, Is. 32, 16).

a different form (*הָרַגְתָּ*); but with *הָרַגְתָּ* may be compared the noun-form *הָרַגְתָּ*, which very frequently expresses an inherent quality, as *חָכָם* *wise*, *חָדָשׁ* *new*, *זָהָב* (prop. *bright yellow*) *gold*. Comp. § 84. a. II. 3.

¹ According to Nöldeke, l.l., p. 419, the original Semitic termination of the 1st sing. Perf. was most probably *ka*; comp. the Ethiopic *qatalu*, Arabic *qatalu*. Halévy declares himself against the interchange of כ and ת, in *Les irrégularités du parfait sémitique* (Mélanges Renier, 1886, p. 447 sq.).

- d* 2. In some weak stems *middle A*, the *Pathah* under the second radical sometimes, in a closed toneless syllable, becomes — , and, in one example, — . Thus from יָרַשְׁתָּהּ : יָרַשְׁתָּהּ and *thou shalt possess it*, Deut. 17, 14; יָרַשְׁתָּם Deut. 19, 1; יָרַשְׁתָּם Deut. 4, 1, and frequently; from יָלַד *to bring forth, to beget*; יָלְדָהּ Ps. 2, 7 (comp. Num. 11, 12; Jer. 2, 27. 15, 10); from שָׁאַל : שָׁאַל Mal. 3, 20; from שָׁאַל : שָׁאַל *I have asked him*, 1 Sam. 1, 20 (Jud. 13, 6), and three times שָׁאַל 1 Sam. 12, 13. 25, 5. Job 21, 29. Qimhi already indicates the explanation, that the ז (ז) of these forms of שָׁאַל and יָרַש is the original vowel, since along with שָׁאַל and יָרַש are also found שָׁאַל and יָרַש (see the Lexicon). The possibility of this explanation cannot be denied (especially in the case of יָרַש , see § 69. s); the ז in these forms might, however, equally well have arisen from an attenuation of ז (§ 27. s), such as must in any case be assumed in the other instances. Moreover, it is worthy of notice that in all the above cases the ז is favoured by the character of the following consonant (a sibilant or lingual), and in most of them also by the tendency towards assimilation of the vowels (comp. § 54. k, and 64. f).
- e* 3. In verbs *middle O*, the *Hölzm* is retained in the tone-syllable, e.g. תָּרַח *thou didst tremble*; יָכְלוּ in *pause* for יָכְלוּ *they were able*; but in a toneless closed syllable the original short vowel reappears in the form of a *Qames-hatuph*; יָכַלְתִּי *I have prevailed against him*, Ps. 13, 5; יָכַלְתָּ (see § 49. h) *then shalt thou be able*, Ex. 18, 23; in a toneless open syllable it becomes vocal *Swd*, e.g. יָכַלְהוּ .
- f* 4. Rarer forms¹ are: *Sing.* 3rd *fem.* in תָּ— (as in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Aramaic), e.g. אָלְתָּ *it is gone*, Deut. 32, 36 (but תָּשַׁבַּחְתָּ Is. 23, 15, which Qimhi and others so explain, is more correctly to be taken as a Participle); from a verb עָצְבָה , comp. § 72. o. This original feminine ending *-at* is regularly retained before suffixes, see § 59. 1, a; and similarly in stems לִי־ , both in the form *at* (which is frequent also in stems לִי־ § 74. g), and also with the *Pathah* weakened to vocal *Swd* before the pleonastic ending תָּ— , e.g. נָלְתָהּ § 75. i. In Ezek. 31, 5 the Aramaic orthography, נָלְתָהּ occurs instead of נָלְתָהּ .
- g* 2nd *masc.* תָּהּ for תָּ (differing only orthographically), e.g. בָּגַדְתָּהּ *thou hast dealt treacherously*, Mal. 2, 14; comp. Gen. 3, 12 (נִתְחַתָּה which is twice as common as נִתְחַתָּה , comp. § 66. h); Gen. 21, 23. 2 Sam. 2, 26. 2 Ki. 9, 3. Is. 2, 6. Ps. 56, 9 (so also in *Hiph'il*; 2 Ki. 9, 7. Is. 37, 23. Ps. 60, 4).
- h* 2nd *fem.* has sometimes a *Yodh* at the end, as in הִלַּכְתִּי *thou wentest*, Jer. 31, 21 (comp. 2, 33. 3, 4. 5. 46, 11, especially common in Jeremiah, and Ezek. 16; see, however, Mic. 4, 13. Ruth 3, 3. 4). הִלַּכְתִּי is really intended, for the vowel signs in the text belong to the marginal reading הִלַּכְתִּי (without י)² as in the corresponding

¹ Many of these forms, which are uncommon in Hebrew, are usual in the other Semitic dialects, and may, therefore, be called Aramaisms (Syriasms) or Arabisms. They must not, however, be regarded as cases of borrowing, but as a return to original forms, for *sentimental reasons*.

² Where the Masora apparently regards the י as the termination of the 2nd *sing. fem.*, e.g. in Jer. 2, 20 (twice), Mic. 4, 13, it has rather taken the form

פָּקַח (פָּקַח) § 32. *h*. The ordinary form has rejected the final *i*, but it regularly reappears when pronominal suffixes are added (§ 58. 1, *c*).

1st *pers. comm.* sometimes without Yodh, as פָּקַח Ps. 140, 13. Job 42, 2. 1 Ki. 8, 48. Ezek. 16, 59 (all in K^{thlbh}), Ps. 16, 2 without a Q^{re}; in 2 Ki. 18, 20 also פָּקַח is really intended, as appears from Is. 36, 5. The Q^{re} requires the ordinary form, to which the vowels of the text properly belong, whilst the K^{thlbh} is probably to be regarded as the remains of an earlier orthography, which omitted vowel-letters even at the end of the word.

ן as the termination of the 2nd *plur. m.* for פָּקַח Ezek. 33, 26, might just possibly be due to the following פ (comp., for an analogous case, Mic. 3, 12, § 87. *e*), but is probably a copyist's error. *Plur. 2nd fem.* in פָּקַח (according to others פָּקַח) Am. 4, 3, but since פ follows, it is perhaps merely due to dittography; comp., however, פָּקַח § 32. *i*.

3rd *comm.* has three times the termination פָּ; פָּקַח Deut. 8, 3. 16 (each time before *h*, and hence, no doubt, if the text is correct, to avoid a hiatus), and in the still more doubtful form פָּקַח Is. 26, 16; on פָּ in the Imperf. see § 47. *m*; on the affixed *h* in Jos. 10, 24. Is. 28, 12, see § 23. *i*.

As in most Semitic languages (see § 47. *c*, note), the 3rd *fem. plur.* in Hebrew seems originally to have been distinguished from the 3rd *masc. plur.* by the termination פָּ, as in Biblical Aramaic. Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 1884, p. 411) referred doubtfully for this to the textual readings in Deut. 21, 7. Jos. 15, 4. 18, 12. 14. 19. Jer. 2, 15. 22, 6, where the Masora uniformly inserts the termination *h*, as well as Gen. 48, 10 in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and Gen. 49, 22. 1 Sam. 4, 15. Ps. 18, 35. Neh. 13, 10. Mayer Lambert (*Une série de Qerê ketib*, Paris, 1891, p. 6 sqq.) definitely explains all these K^{thlbh}, as well as Ps. 73, 2. Jer. 50, 6 (?), and (against Nöldeke) 1 Ki. 22, 49. Job 16, 16, also Jer. 48, 41. 51, 56. Ezek. 26, 2. Ps. 68, 14, as remains of the 3rd *fem. plur.* in פָּ. This was abandoned as being indistinguishable from the (later) form of the 3rd *fem. sing.*, but tended to be retained in the perfect of verbs פָּקַח, as היה K^{thlbh} six times in the above examples.

5. The affirmatives פָּ, (פָּ), פָּ, וּ are generally toneless, and the forms with these inflexions are consequently *Mil'!!* (פָּקַח, &c.); with the other affirmatives they are *Milra'* (§ 15. *c*). The place of the tone may, however, be shifted: (α) by the *pause* (§ 29, 4), whenever a vowel which has become vocal Šwā under the second stem-consonant is restored by the *pause*; as פָּקַח for פָּקַח (פָּקַח), and פָּקַח for פָּקַח (פָּקַח); (β) in certain cases after *wāw* consecutive of the Perfect (see § 49. *h*).

as 1st *pers. sing.* (comp. Stade, *Gramm.* p. 253); so in Jud. 5, 7, where פָּקַח, on account of verse 12, must either have originally been intended as 2nd *sing. fem.*, or is due to an erroneous pronunciation of the form פָּקַח as פָּקַח instead of 3rd *sing. fem.* פָּקַח (as LXX).

¹ That these examples can hardly be referred to a primitive Semitic ending *an* in the 3rd *plur. Perf.*, has been shown by Nöldeke in the *ZDMG.*, vol. 38, p. 409 sqq.; comp. also *ZDMG.*, vol. 32, p. 757 sq., where G. Hoffmann proves that the terminations in *Nun* of the 3rd *plur.* in Aramaic, formerly adduced by us, are secondary forms. [See also Driver, *Heb. Tenses*, p. 6 note.]

- o 6. Contraction of a final ׀ with the ׀ of the affirmative occurs e.g. in קָרָאִי Hag. 2, 5, &c.; cf. Is. 14, 20, &c. in the *Perf. Po'el* and Deut. 4, 25 in the *High'el* of שָׁחַת; Is. 21, 2, &c. in the *High'el* of שָׁחַת. Contraction of a final ׀ with the affirmative ו occurs in נָתַן Gen. 34, 16; in *Niph.* Ezr. 9, 7, comp. 2 Chron. 14, 10; in *High.* 2 Chron. 29, 19; with the affirmative ׀ in the *Imperfect Qal* Ezek. 17, 23; *Pi'el* Ps. 71, 23, where with Baer הִרְצִיָה is to be read, according to others הִרְצִיָה (comp. in *Pil.* הִרְצִיָה Ezek. 32, 16), but certainly not הִרְצִיָה with the Mantua ed., Opius and Hahn; with ׀ in the *Imperat. High.* Gen. 4, 23. Is. 32, 9.

§ 45. The Infinitive.

- a 1. The Infinitive is represented in Hebrew by two forms, a shorter and a longer; both are, however, strictly speaking, independent nouns (*verbal substantives*). The shorter form, the *Infinitive construct* (in Qal קָטַל¹, sometimes incorrectly קָטַל), is used in very various ways, sometimes in connexion with pronominal suffixes, or governing a substantive in the genitive, or with an accusative of the object (§ 115), sometimes in connexion with prepositions (לְקָטַל to kill, § 114. f), and sometimes in dependence upon substantives as genitive, or upon verbs as accusative of the object. On the other hand, the use of the longer form, the *Infinitive absolute* (in Qal קָטַל, sometimes also קָטַל), is restricted to those cases in which it emphasizes the abstract verbal idea, without regard to the subject or object of the action. It stands most frequently as an adverbial accusative along with a finite verb of the same stem (see further § 113. 2)².
- b The flexibility and versatility of the Infin. constr. and the rigidity and inflexibility of the Infin. absol. are reflected in their vocalization. The latter has unchangeable vowels, while the *o* of the Infin. constr. may be lost. For קָטַל, according to § 93. i, goes back to the ground-form *qutl* (*qotl*); hence e.g. with a suffix, קָטַלִּי qōṭli, my killing.
- c Other forms of the Infin. constr. Qal of the strong verb are—
- (a) קָטַל, e.g. קָטַב לִי to lie, Gen. 34, 7; קָטַל to sink, Eccles. 12, 4; especially with verbs which have *ā* in the second syllable of the Imperf.: hence sometimes with those, whose second or third radical is a guttural (frequently besides the ordinary form). All the examples (except קָטַב, see above) occur in the closest connexion with the following word, or with suffixes (see § 61. c). In Ezek. 21, 33

¹ Comp. the analogous forms of the noun, § 93. i.

² The terms *absolute* and *construct* are of course not to be understood as implying that the Infin. constr. קָטַל forms the *construct state* (see § 89) of the Infin. absol. (קָטַל ground-form *qutl*). In the Paradigms the *Inf. constr.*, as the principal form, is placed before the other, under the name of Infinitive simply.

the Masora seems to treat לְמַבֵּחַ (verse 20, in *pause* לְמַבֵּחַ) as an Infinitive = לְמַבֵּחַ; probably לְמַבֵּחַ should be read.

(d) קָטְלָה and, attenuated from it, קָטְלָה; קָטְלָה and קָטְלָה (which are feminine forms¹ of קָטַל and קָטַל, mostly from intransitive verbs, and sometimes found along with forms having no feminine ending in use), e.g. לְאַטְמָה *to be guilty*, Lev. 5, 26, אָהַבָה *to love*, שָׂנְאָה *to hate*; לִירָאָה, often in Deut., *to fear*; וְקָנָה *to be old*; קָרָאָה *to meet* (in לְקָרָאָה § 19. k); לִרְבָּעָה *to lie down*, Lev. 20, 16; לְמִשְׁחָה *to anoint*, Ex. 29, 29; לְרַחֲצָה *to wash*, Ex. 30, 18, &c.; לְמַטְמָאָה (also a subst. = *uncleanness*, like מְטָמָאָה), *to be unclean*, Lev. 15, 32; קָרְבָּה *to approach*, Ex. 36, 2 and elsewhere; comp. Deut. 11, 22. Is. 30, 19. Ezek. 21, 16. Hag. 1, 6; also רָחַקָה *to be far off*, Ezek. 8, 6; חָמְלָה *to pity*, Ezek. 16, 5; comp. Hos. 7, 4. On the other hand in חָמְלָה Gen. 19, 16, the original *d* has been modified to *z*; comp. חָזַקָה Is. 8, 11 and elsewhere.

(c) In the Aramaic manner (לְמַקְטַל but cf. also Arab. *magtal*), there occur as *Inf. Qal*: מָגַרְשׁ *to cast out*, Ezek. 36, 5; מִשְׁלַח *to send*, Est. 9, 19; מָקָרָה *to call* and מָפַע *to depart*, Num. 10, 2 (Deut. 10, 11); מָסַח *to take*, 2 Chron. 19, 7 and elsewhere; מָסָא *to carry*, Num. 4, 24 and elsewhere (comp. even מִשְׁאֲלוֹת Ezek. 17, 9); also with a feminine ending מָעַלָה *to go up*, Ezr. 7, 9, &c.; comp. for these forms (almost all very late) Ryssel, *De Elohista Pentateuchici sermone*, p. 50, and Strack in his *Commentary* on Num. 4, 24.

2. A kind of *Gerund* is formed by the *Inf. constr.* with the preposition לְ; as לְקַטֵּל *ad interficiendum*, לְנַפֵּל *ad cadendum* (see § 28. a).

The blending of the לְ with the *Inf. constr.* into a single grammatical form *g* seems to be indicated by the firmly closed syllable, comp. לְשָׁכַב Gen. 34, 7; לְנַפֵּל Ps. 118, 13, with *Dageš lene* in the D = *lin-pōl*; hence, also *liq-tōl*, &c.; but לְנַפֵּל *bin-phōl*, Job 4, 13; לְנַפֵּל 2 Sam. 3, 34. Exceptions לְבָאָה Num. 4, 23. 8, 24; לְנָתַח Jer. 1, 10. 18, 7. 31, 28; לְשָׁדֹר Jer. 47, 4; לְמַבֵּחַ Jer. 11, 19, &c., Ps. 37, 14; according to some also לְכַבֵּב Num. 21, 4 and לְכַבֵּשׁ 2 Chron. 28, 10 (Beaer לְכַבֵּשׁ); on the contrary לְשָׁכַב Gen. 35, 22; לְנָפֹר Jer. 17, 2. For the meaningless לְרָדַשׁ Ezr. 10, 16 read לְרָדַשׁ.

§ 46. The Imperative.

1. The ground-forms of the Imperative, קָטַל (properly *qātūl*, which *a* is for an original *qātūl*), and קָטַל (see below, letter c), the same in pronunciation as the forms of the *Inf. constr.* (§ 45), are also the basis for the formation of the Imperfect (§ 47)². They represent

¹ According to the remark of Elias Levita in Qimhi's *Mikhlol*, ed. Rittenb., 14 a, these feminine forms occur almost exclusively in connexion with the preposition לְ.

² The *Inf. absol.*, like the Greek *Inf.*, is also sometimes used for the Imperative (§ 113. bb). Comp. in general, Koch, *Der semitische Inf.* (Schaffhausen, 1874).

the *second* person, and have both fem. and plur. forms. The third person is supplied by the Imperfect in the Jussive (§ 109. *b*); and even the second person must always be expressed by the Jussive, if it be used with a negative, e.g. **אַל-תִּקְטֹל** *ne occidas* (not **אַל-תִּקְטֹל**). The passives have no Imperative, but it occurs in the reflexives, as Niph'al and Hithpa'el¹.

- b* 2. The Affirmatives of the *2nd sing. fem.* and the *2nd plur. masc.* and *fem.* are identical in every case with those of the Imperfect (§ 47. 2). In the same way, the Imperative of the *2nd sing. masc.*, in common with the Imperfect, admits of the lengthening by the **הִתְּ** *paragogicum* (§ 48. *i*), as, on the other hand, there are certain shortened forms of this person analogous to the Jussive (§ 48. 5).

- c* Rem. 1. Instead of the form **קָטַל** (sometimes also *plene*, e.g. **שָׁמֹר** Eccles. 12, 13; before *Maqqeph* **קָטַל** with *Qameṣ-ḥaṭuṣh*), those verbs which have an *a* in the final syllable of the *Imperf.* (i. e. especially verbs middle *ā*) make their Imperative of the form **קָטַל**, e.g. **לְבַשׁ** *dress!* (Perf. **לָבַשׁ** and **לָבַשׁ**); **שָׁכַב** *lie down!* in *pause* **שָׁכַב** 1 Sam. 3, 5. 6. 9.

- d* 2. The first syllable of the *sing. fem.* and *plur. masc.* are usually to be pronounced with *Swa medium* (*qīṣṣā*, *qīṣṣā*, and so **שָׁכַב**, &c. without *Dageš lene*, and even **מָשַׁכְו** with *Metheg*, Ex. 12, 21; but compare **מָסַח** Jer. 10, 17, and with the same phonetic combination **חָשַׁח** Is. 47, 2; see analogous cases in § 93. *m*); less frequently we find an *ē* instead of the *ī*, e.g. **מָלַכְי** *rule*, Jud. 9, 10; **מָשַׁכְו** *draw*, Ex. 32, 20; **חָרַבְי** Jer. 2, 12 (comp. **חָרַבְי** Is. 44, 27); **קָסַחְי** 1 Sam. 28, 8 *Q^{re}*; **צָעַחְי** Jer. 22, 20 (comp. 1 Ki. 13, 7), see § 10. *g*. This *ē* arises (see above, letter *a*) from a singular ground-form *qāṣṣā*, not from a retraction of the original *ā* of the second syllable. We must abandon the view that the forms with *ī* in the first syllable (cf. also **מָחַרְי**, **מָחַרְי**, **מָכַרְי**, **עָכַרְי**) arise from a weakening of the characteristic vowel *ē*. They, or at least some of them, must rather be regarded with Barth (*ZDMG.* 1889, p. 182) as analogous to the original *ī*-imperfects. See further analogies in §§ 47. *i* and 48. *i*; 61. *b*, 63. *n*.

- e* The *pausal* form of the *2nd plur. masc.* is **וָאָרָו** 1 Ki. 3, 26; from **שָׁמַעְו**, &c.; similarly the *2nd sing. fem.* in *pause* is **עָבְרִי** Is. 23, 12; even without the *pause* **מָלוּכְי** Jud. 9, 10. 12, *Kth*; **קָסַחְי** 1 Sam. 28, 8, *Kth*. (comp. with this also **מָלוּכְו**, &c., § 48. *i*); from **שָׁמַחְי**, **שָׁמַחְי** Joel 2, 21.

- f* 3. In the *2nd plur. fem.* **שָׁמַעְו** occurs once, in Gen. 4, 23 (for **שָׁמַעְוָה**) with loss of the **הִתְּ** and insertion of a helping vowel, unless it is simply to be pointed **שָׁמַעְוָה**. Also instead of the abnormal **קָרָאְו** Ex. 2, 20 (for **קָרָאְוָה**) we should perhaps read as in Ruth 1, 20 **קָרָאְוָה** (comp. **מָצָאְוָה** 1, 9 and **לָבָאְוָה** 1, 12).

¹ In *Hoph'al* an Imperative is found only twice (Ezek. 32, 19. Jer. 49, 8), and closely approximating in meaning to the reflexive.

§ 47. *The Imperfect and its Inflection.*

1. The persons of the Imperfect¹, in contra-distinction to those *a* of the Perfect, are formed by placing abbreviated forms of the personal pronoun (preformatives) *before* the stem, or rather before the abstract form of the stem (לכל). As, however, the tone is retained on the characteristic vowel of the Stem-form, or even (as in the *2nd sing. fem.* and the *3rd* and *2nd plur. masc.*) passes over to the affirmatives, the preformatives of the Imperfect appear in a much more abbreviated form than the affirmatives of the Perfect, only *one* consonant (א, פ, כ, נ) remaining in each form. But as this preformative united to the stem-form was not *always* sufficient to express at the same time differences both of gender and number, the distinction had to be indicated, in several cases, by *special affirmatives*. Comp. the Table, § 40. c.

2. The derivation and meaning, both of the preformatives and the *b* affirmatives, can still, in most cases, be recognized.

In the *first pers.* אנכי, plur. אנחנו, כ is probably connected with אני, and נ with נחם; here no indication of gender or number by a special ending was necessary. As regards the vocalization, the

¹ On the use of the Semitic Perfect and Imperfect cf. § 106 sqq. and the literature cited in § 106. For our present purpose the following account will suffice:—The name *Imperfect* is here used in direct opposition to the Perfect, and is to be taken in a wider sense than in Latin and Greek grammar. The Hebrew (Semitic) *Perf.* denotes in general that which is *concluded*, *completed*, and *past*, that which has happened and has come into effect; but at the same time, also that which is *represented* as accomplished, even though it be continued into present time or even be actually still future. The *Imperf.* denotes, on the other hand, the *beginning*, the *unfinished*, and the *continuing*, that which is just happening, which is conceived as in process of coming to pass, and hence, also, that which is yet future; likewise also that which occurs repeatedly or in a continuous sequence in the past (Latin Imperf.). It follows from the above that the once common designation of the Imperf. as a *Future* emphasizes only *one* side of its meaning. In fact, the use of Indo-Germanic tense-names for the Semitic tenses, which was adopted by the Syrians under the influence of the Greek grammarians, and after their example by the Arabs, and finally by Jewish scholars, has involved many misconceptions. The Indo-Germanic scheme of three periods of time (past, present, and future) is entirely foreign to the Semitic tense-idea, which regards an occurrence only from the point of view of completed or incomplete action.—In the formation of the two tenses the primary distinction is that in the Perfect the verbal stem precedes and the indication of the person is added afterwards for precision, while in the Imperf. the subject, from which the action proceeds or about which a condition is predicated, is expressed by a prefixed pronoun.

Arabic points to the ground-forms *äqtül* and *näqtül*: the *ä* of the 1st plur. is, therefore, as in the other preformatives, attenuated from *a*. The *Sghöl* of the 1st sing. is probably to be explained by the preference of the *n* for this sound (comp. § 22. *o*, also § 51. *p*); according to Qimhi, it arises from an endeavour to avoid the similarity of sound between *נבא* (which is the Babylonian punctuation) and *נבא*, which, according to this view, was likewise pronounced *iqtol*¹.

- c* The preformative *n* of the *second* persons (*נבא*, ground-form *täqtül*, &c.) is, without doubt, connected with the *n* of *נבא*, *נבא*, &c., and the *affirmative* ' of the 2nd fem. sing. *נבא* with the *i* of the original feminine form *נבא* (see § 32. *h*). The *affirmative* ' of the 2nd masc. plur. *נבא* (in its more complete form, *נבא*, see Rem. 4) is the *sign of the plural*, as in the 3rd pers., and also in the Perfect (§ 44. *l*). In the Imperfect, however, it is restricted in both persons to the masculine², while the affirmative *נבא* (also *נבא*) of the 3rd and 2nd plur. fem. is probably connected with *נבא eae* and *נבא vos* (fem.).
- d* The preformatives of the *third* persons (*i* in the masc. *נבא*, ground-form *yäqtül*, plur. *נבא*, ground-form *yäqtülä*; *n* in the fem. *נבא*, plur. *נבא*) have not yet met with any satisfactory explanation. With *n* might most obviously be compared the original feminine

¹ Compare § 24. *e*. In favour of the above view of Qimhi may be urged the phonetic orthography *נבא* (in Prov. 18, 24 *נבא*), 2 Sam. 14, 19. Mic. 6, 10, for *נבא*, and *נבא* 1 Chron. 2, 13 for *נבא* (as verse 12). Also *נבא* Mic. 6, 11 is probably for *נבא* = *נבא*, *נבא* Is. 10, 12 for *נבא*; *נבא* Is. 51, 19 for *נבא*; and conversely (according to Wellhausen, *Text der BB. Sam.* p. 5) *נבא* was written for *נבא*. Similarly, *נבא* 1 Sam. 14, 49 is probably for *נבא* or *נבא*; in 2 Sam. 23, 8 *נבא* is, according to the LXX, an error for *נבא* = *נבא*. In Assyrian also the simple *i* corresponds to the Hebrew ' as the preformative of the Impf. Qal.

² This is also the proper gender of the plural syllable *ä*, *än*. In Hebrew, certainly, it is used in the 3rd plur. Perfect for both genders, but in the kindred languages only for the masculine, e. g. in Syriac *q'idlä*, *q'idlä*, with the feminine form *q'idlä*, in Western Aramaic *q'idlä*, fem. *q'idlä*; in Arabic *qädlä*, fem. *qädlä*, Ethiopic *qädlä*, *qädlä*.

³ The usual derivation of the ' from the ' of the pronoun *נבא*, comparing *נבא* for *נבא* (§ 69), has little in its favour, and does not explain the *Yodh preformative* of the plural. Rödiger conjectured that there formerly existed a corresponding pronoun of the 3rd pers. (*ya*?), and compared the Amharic *yäh* (this) and *ya* (who), on the assumption that these are old Semitic forms. It is deserving of notice, moreover, that in Arabic and Western Aramaic *Yodh* also appears as the preformative of the 3rd fem. plur. (see below, letter *k*).

ending ל־ of nouns, and of the 3rd fem. sing. perfect. For the affirmatives י (י) and נָה , see letter *c*.

3. The characteristic vowel of the second syllable becomes $\text{Šwā } e$ before tone-bearing affirmatives which begin with a vowel, but is retained (as being in the tone-syllable) before the toneless affirmative נָה . Thus: יִשְׁכַּבְתִּי , יִשְׁכַּבְתִּי , יִשְׁכַּבְתִּי (but in *pause* יִשְׁכַּבְתִּי , &c.), יִשְׁכַּבְתִּי .

Rem. 1. The \bar{o} of the second syllable (as in the inf. constr. and imper.), being *f* lengthened from an original \bar{a} in the tone-syllable, is only tone-long (§ 9. *r*). Hence it follows that: (a) it is only incorrectly, although somewhat frequently, written *plene*; (b) before *Maqqeph* the short vowel reappears as *Qameṣ-haṭṭuf*, e. g. וַיִּכְתֹּב שָׁם and *he wrote there*, Jos. 8, 32 (but compare also Ex. 21, 37. Jos. 18, 20); (c) it becomes Šwā before the tone-bearing affirmatives י־ and נָה (see above, No. 3; but Jerome still heard e. g. *iesbuleni* = יִשְׁבֹּלְנִי ; cf. *ZA W.* iv. 83).

Quite anomalous are the three examples which, instead of a shortening to Šwā , exhibit a long \bar{a} : וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי Ex. 18, 26, immediately before the principal pause, but according to Qimhi (ed. *Rittenb.* p. 18^b), and against our editions, with the tone on the ultima; likewise וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי Ruth 2, 8; וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי (in principal pause) Prov. 14, 3. In the first two cases perhaps וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי and וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי (for וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי , &c.) are intended, in virtue of a retrogressive effect of the pause, while in Prov. 14, 3 וַיִּשְׁכַּבְתִּי is to be read, with August Müller.

The \bar{o} of the second syllable is to be found almost exclusively with verbs *middle a*, like קָטַל . Intransitives *middle a* and *e* almost always keep \bar{a} (*Pathah*),¹ in the imperf., e. g. יָרַבַּץ , יָרַבַּץ to *couch*, יָשָׁב , יָשָׁב to *lie down* (לָמַד , לָמַד to *learn* is also originally intransitive = *to accustom oneself*); גָּדַל , יָגַדַל to *become great* (but comp. שָׁכַן and שָׁכַן imperf. יִשְׁכֹּן to *dwell* and *to inhabit*, נָבַל imperf. יִבֹּל to *wither*); also from verbs *middle o*, as קָטַן to *be small*, the imperf. has the form יִקְטֹן .

Sometimes both forms occur together; those with \bar{o} having a transitive, and those with \bar{a} an intransitive meaning, e. g. יָקַצַר *he cuts off*, יִקְצַר *he is cut off*, i. e. *is short*; יָשָׁר imperf. \bar{o} , to *overcome*, Ex. 17, 13; imperf. \bar{a} , to *be overcome*, Job 14, 10. More rarely both forms are used without any distinction, e. g. יָשָׁף and יִשְׁפֹּף *he bites*, יָחַץ and יִחַץ *he is inclined* (but only the latter with a transitive meaning = *he bends*, in Job 40, 17). On the \bar{a} of the imperf. of verbs *middle* and *third guttural*, comp. § 64. *b*; § 65. *b*. In some verbs first guttural (§ 63. *n*), עָרַע (§ 67. *p*), עָרַע (§ 69. 1), and עָרַע (§ 68. 1), and in יָתַן for *yintēn* from נָתַן to *give*, instead of \bar{a} or \bar{o} a moveable *Sere* (originally *i*) is found in the second syllable. A trace of these *i*-imperfects² in the ordinary strong verb is probably to be found in יִמְסֹךְ 2 Ki. 7, 8, since מָסַךְ otherwise only occurs in Qal. We call these three forms of the imperfect after their characteristic vowel imperf. *o*, imperf. *a*, imperf. *e*.

¹ This \bar{a} is, however, by no means restricted to intransitives in the strong verb; apart from verbs third guttural (§ 65. *b*), it is to be found in יָעָרַע and עָרַע , and in many verbs מָעָרַע and עָרַע (§§ 69-71).

² Cf. Barth, 'Das *i*-Imperfekt im Nordsemitischen,' *ZDMG.* 1889, p. 177 sqq.

k 3. For the 3rd *sing. fem.* תִּקְטֹל (= *tig-töl*), Baer requires in 1 Sam. 25, 20 תִּקְטֹל (read with ed. Mant. &c. תִּקְטֹל). For the 2nd *sing. fem.* (תִּקְטִילִי) the form תִּקְטֹל is found in Is. 57, 8. Jer. 3, 5. Ezek. 22, 4. 23, 32, in every case after the regular form; but cf. also Ezek. 26, 14. For the 3rd *plur. fem.* תִּקְטֹלְנָה we find in Jer. 49, 11, in pause תִּקְטֹלְנָה (for תִּקְטֹלְנָה), and thrice (as if to distinguish it from the 2nd pers.) the form תִּקְטֹלְנָה with the preformative י (as always in Western Aram., Arab., Eth., and Assy.), in Gen. 30, 38. 1 Sam. 6, 12. Dan. 8, 22. On the other hand, תִּקְטֹלְנָה appears in some cases to have been incorrectly used even for the fem. of the 3rd pers. or for the masc. of the 2nd pers. *sing.* as תִּקְטֹלְנָה Jud. 5, 26, where, however, perhaps תִּקְטֹלְנָה is to be read, and Obad. 13, for 2nd *sing. masc.*, according to Olshausen a corruption of תִּקְטֹלְנָה; comp. Prov. 1, 20, 8, 3. In Ex. 1, 10 read תִּקְטֹלְנָה; in Is. 27, 11. 28, 3, as also in Job 17, 16, it is equally possible to explain the form as a plural. This small number of examples hardly justifies our finding in the above-mentioned passages the remains of an emphatic form of the Impf., analogous to the Arab. *Modus energicus I*, with the termination *ānnā*.

l For נָה we frequently find, especially in the Pentateuch and mostly after *wāw consecutive* (see § 49. 2), simply , נָה, e.g. Gen. 19, 33. 36. 37, 7. Ex. 1, 18. 19. 15, 20. Num. 25, 2. Ezek. 3, 20. 16, 55; in Arab. always *nā*. According to Elias Levita, תִּקְטֹלְנָה (2 Sam. 13, 18) is the only example of this kind in the strong verb. The form תִּקְטֹלְנָה (so both Qimhi and ed. Mant.; but Baer תִּקְטֹלְנָה) for תִּקְטֹלְנָה *they were high*, Ezek. 16, 50, is irregular, with וָ inserted after the manner of verbs עָלָה and עָלָה, § 67. *d*; § 72. *i*; according to Olshausen it is an error caused by the following form.

m 4. Instead of the plural forms in י there are, especially in the older Books, over 300 forms¹ with the fuller ending יָ (with *Nūn paragoga*), always bearing the tone; compare § 29. *m* and § 44. *l*; on its retention before suffixes § 60. *e*; also defectively יָרִיבֵן Ex. 21, 18. 22, 8, &c. This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of sentences (in the principal pause), in which case also the (pausal) vowel of the second syllable is generally retained. Thus there arise full-sounding forms such as יִלְכְּטוּן *they collect*, Ps. 104, 28; יִרְגְּזוּן *they tremble*, Ex. 15, 14; יִשְׁמְעוּן *ye shall hear*, Deut. 1, 17; comp. Jos. 24, 15, with *Segolta*; Is. 17, 12 twice, in verse 13 with *Zaqeph qafon*, 41, 5 after *wāw consec.* Without the pause, e.g. Ps. 11, 2 יִדְרְבֵן קֶשֶׁת, comp. 4, 3: Gen. 18, 28. 29. 30 sqq. 44, 1. Jos. 4, 6 (יִשְׁאֲלוּן); Is. 8, 12. 1 Sam. 9, 13. Ruth 2, 9 (יִקְצְרוּן and יִשְׁאֲבוּן); Jud. 11, 18 after *wāw consec.*

Some of these examples may be partly due to euphonic laws, e.g. certainly Ex. 17, 5. Num. 16, 29. 32, 20. 1 Sam. 9, 13. 1 Ki. 9, 6, and often, to avoid

¹ [See details in Böttcher, § 930; and cf. Driver on 1 Sam. 2, 15.]

§ 48.] *Shortening and Lengthening of Imperfect.* 131

a hiatus before \aleph or γ . It was, however, the pause especially which exerted an influence on the restoration of this older and fuller termination (cf. § 159. c, note), as is manifest from Is. 26, 11: $\text{וַיֵּבֶשׁוּ וַיִּחְזְזוּ וַיִּחְזְזוּ וַיִּחְזְזוּ}$ they see not; may they see and become ashamed. All this applies also to the corresponding forms in the Imperfect of the derived conjugations¹. In Aramaic and Arabic this earlier ן (old Arabic *and*) is the regular termination; but in some dialects of vulgar Arabic it has also become ד .

With an affixed \aleph we find (in the imperf. Niph'al) וַיִּשְׁלַח Jer. 10, 5, evidently an error for וַיִּשְׁלַח־ , caused by the preceding וַיִּשְׁלַח .—In וַיִּשְׁלַח־ Is. 35, 1, the ending ן is changed into ד before the following ד .

5. Corresponding to the use of ן for י there occurs in the 2nd sing. fem., although much less frequently, the fuller ending ן־ (as in Aram. and Arab.; old Arab. *ind*), always with the tone, for י־ , generally again in the principal pause, and almost in all cases with retention of the vowel of the penultima; thus וַיִּשְׁלַח־ Ruth 2, 8, 21, cf. 3, 4, 18. 1 Sam. 1, 14 (וַיִּשְׁלַח־). Jer. 31, 22. Is. 45, 10.

6. On the reappearance in pause of the \bar{o} which had become \bar{e} in the forms וַיִּשְׁלַח־ , &c., see above, letter e ; similarly, the imperfects with \bar{a} restore this vowel in pause and at the same time lengthen it (as a tone-vowel) to \bar{a} , hence, e.g. וַיִּשְׁלַח־ . This influence of the pause extends even to the forms without affirmatives, e.g. וַיִּשְׁלַח־ in pause וַיִּשְׁלַח־ . Only the fuller forms in *an* and *fn* have the tone always on the ultima, since the vowels \bar{a} and \bar{e} in a closed final syllable never allow of the retraction of the tone.

§ 48. *Shortening and Lengthening of the Imperfect and Imperative.* *The Jussive and Cohortative.*

1. Certain modifications which take place in the form of the *a* imperfect, and express invariably, or nearly so, a distinct shade of meaning, serve to some extent as a compensation for the want of special forms for the *Tempora relativa* and for certain *moods* of the verb...

2. Along with the usual form of the imperfect, there exists also δ a lengthened form of it (the *cohortative*), and a shortened form (the *jussive*)². The former occurs (with few exceptions) only in the 1st person, while the latter is mostly found in the 2nd and 3rd persons, and less frequently in the 1st person. The laws of the tone, however, and of the formation of syllables in Hebrew, not infrequently precluded the indication of the jussive by an actual shortening of the form;

¹ It is to be observed that the Chronicles often omit the *Nān*, where it is found in the parallel passage in the Books of Kings; comp. 1 Ki. 8, 38. 43 with 2 Chron. 6, 29. 33; 1 Ki. 12, 24. 2 Ki. 11, 5 with 2 Chron. 11, 4. 23, 4.

² The perfect has only *one* form, since it cannot be used, like the imperfect, to express mood-relations (see § 106. ρ).

consequently it often—and, in the imperfect forms with affirmatives, always—coincides with the ordinary imperfect (*indicative*) form.

In classical Arabic the difference is almost always evident. That language distinguishes, besides the indicative *yāqtulū*, (a) a subjunctive, *yāqtulū*; (b) a jussive, *yāqtul*; (c) a double 'energetic' mood of the impf., *yāqtulūnnā* and *yāqtulūlān*, in pause *yāqtulā*, the last form thus corresponding to the Hebrew cohortative.

c 3. The characteristic of the cohortative form consists in a long הָ affixed to the 1st pers. sing. or plur., e.g. אֶשְׁמְרָה from שָׁמַר. It occurs in almost all conjugations and classes of the strong and weak verb (except of course in the passives), and this final הָ has the tone wherever the affirmatives ו and י would have it. As before these endings, so also before the הָ cohortative, the moveable vowel of the last syllable of the verbal form becomes *Šwd*, e.g. in Qal אֶשְׁמְרָה *I will observe*, in Pi'el נִשְׁמְרָה *let us break asunder*, Ps. 2, 3; on אֶשְׁמְרָה Is. 18, 4 *Q'rē* (comp. also 27, 4. Ezr. 8, 25, &c.), see § 10. h; with the *K'thibh* of these passages, compare the analogous cases יִשְׁמְרוּ, &c., § 47. g. On the other hand, an unchangeable vowel in the final syllable is retained as tone-vowel before the הָ, as (e.g.) in Hiph. אֶזְכְּרָה *I will praise*. Finally (as before *d* and *t*), the vowel which became *Šwd* is restored in pause as tone-vowel; thus for the cohortative אֶשְׁמְרָה the pausal form is אֶשְׁמְרָה, Ps. 59, 10; comp. Gen. 18, 21. Is. 41, 26.

d The change of הָ into the obtuse הֲ seems to occur in 1 Sam. 28, 15, unless, with Nestle, we are to assume a blending of readings, וְאֶמְרָה and וְאֶמְרָה; and with the 3rd pers. Ps. 20, 4, in a syllable sharpened by a following *Dageš forte conjunct.*; compare similar cases of the change of הָ into the obtuse הֲ in § 80. d; perhaps, however, וְאֶמְרָה—with suffix—is rather intended. An הָ cohort. is also found with the 3rd pers. in Is. 5, 19 (twice); Ezek. 23, 20, and again in verse 16 according to the *Q'rē*, but in both these cases without any influence on the meaning, as also Prov. 1, 20 and 8, 3; see above, § 47. k. Probably another instance occurs in Job 11, 17, although there אֶמְרָה might also, with Qimhi, be regarded as 2nd masc. The doubly irregular form תְּבֹאֲתָה Deut. 33, 16 (for תְּבֹאֲתָה = תְּבֹאֲתָה) is to be explained with Olshausen and König as a scribal error, due to a confusion with תְּבֹאֲתָה in verse 14. For תְּבֹאֲתָה Job 22, 21 the noun תְּבֹאֲתָה *thine increase*, might be meant, but the Masora has evidently intended an imperfect with the ending *at*, instead of הָ, before the

¹ Probably this *ā* is abridged from the syllable *an*, which in Arabic (see above, Rem. to letter *b*) is used for the formation of the 'energetic' mood, and in Hebrew (see the foot-note to § 58. i) often stands before suffixes.

§ 48.] *Shortening and Lengthening of Imperfect.* 133

suffix; on the analogy of the 3rd sing. fem. perfect, see § 59. 1, a; on תבאחי 1 Sam. 25, 34, see § 76. g

The cohortative expresses the direction of the will to an action and thus denotes especially self-encouragement (in the 1st plur. an exhortation to others at the same time), a resolution or a wish, as an optative, &c., see § 108. X

4. The general characteristic of the jussive form of the imperfect is rapidity of pronunciation, combined with a tendency to retract^f the tone from the final syllable, in order by that means to express the urgency of the command in the very first syllable. This tendency has, in certain forms, even caused a material shortening of the termination of the word, so that the expression of the command appears to be concentrated on a single syllable. In other cases, however, the jussive is simply marked by a shortening of the vowel of the second syllable, without its losing the tone, and very frequently (see above, letter *b*) the nature of the form does not admit of any alteration. It is not impossible, however, that even in such cases the jussive in the living language was distinguished from the indicative by a change in the place of the tone.

In the strong verb the jussive differs in form from the indicative only in Hiph'il (juss. יִקְטֹל, ind. יִקְטִיל), and similarly in the weak verb, wherever the imperfect indicative has *el* in the second syllable, e.g. from יִשָּׁב impf. Hiph. יִשְׁבֵּב, juss. יִשָּׁב; from יָמַח and יָמַח, also in *Qal* of the verbs יָעַר and יָעַר, as יָמַח, ind. יָמַח; יָגַל, ind. יָגַל; in all conjugations of verbs יָלַח, so that the rejection (*apocope*) of the ending הֶ- in *Qal* and *Hiph.* gives rise to monosyllabic forms, with or without a helping vowel under the second radical, e.g. *Qal* ind. יִגְלֶה, juss. יִגְלֵ; *Hiph.* ind. יִגְלֶה, juss. יִגְלֵ; also in the *Pi'el* יִצַּח from the indic. יִצַּח (called the apocopated imperfects). But even so almost all² the plural forms of the jussive coincide with those of the indicative, except that the jussive excludes the lengthened ending הֶן. Neither do

¹ According to Praetorius, however (*ZAW.* 1883, p. 24 sq.), those cases in which the penultima of the jussive, or of the imperfect consecutive (see § 49. 2) bears the tone, are survivals of the oldest Hebrew tone-system; see notes on § 44. *b*, and § 75. *kk*.

² Only in 1st plur. do we find a few shortened forms, as יִשְׁאָר 1 Sam. 14, 36, parallel with cohortatives; and נִרְאָה Is. 41, 23 *K'h*.

the forms of the 2nd sing. fem., as תִּגְלִי, תִּמְצִלִי, &c., admit of any change in the jussive, nor any forms of the singular or plural to which suffixes are attached, e.g. תִּמְצִלִי as ind. Jer. 38, 15, as jussive Jer. 41, 8.

X *h* The meaning of this form is similar to that of the cohortative, except that in the jussive the command or wish is limited almost exclusively to the 2nd or 3rd pers. On special uses of the jussive, e.g. in hypothetical sentences (even in the 1st pers.), see § 109. 2.

i 5. The imperative, in accordance with its other points of connexion with the imperfect in form and meaning, admits of a similar lengthening (by הַ, Arab. *imper. energicus*, with the ending -ānnā or -ān, in pause -ā) and shortening. Thus in *Qal* of the strong verb, the lengthened form of שָׁמַר *guard* is יִשְׁמְרָה (šdm'rd, comp. קִטְלֵה qitl'ē, § 46. d); Jer. 49, 11; שָׁכַב *lie down*; שָׁמַע *hear*, in lesser pause שְׁמָעָה Dan. 9, 19. Comp., however, also מָכַר *sell*, Gen. 25, 31, notwithstanding the impf. יִמְכַּר; עָרַב *Job* 33, 5 (comp. עָרַב Jer. 46, 3), but impf. יַעֲרֹב; אָסַף *collect*, Num. 11, 16 (for אָסַף comp. § 63. l and the plural אֶסְפוּ), but 2nd masc. אֶסֶף; נָצַח Ps. 141, 3. Barth (see above, § 47. i note) finds in these forms a trace of old imperfects in *i*, cf. § 63. n. On the other hand, קָרַב Ps. 69, 9, but impf. יִקְרַב. Without הַ, we have the form לָךְ *go*, Num. 23, 13. Jud. 19, 13. The form קָטַל in pause becomes קָטְלָה, the form קָטַל becomes קָטְלָה, e.g. הִנֵּה and רָגַח (in both cases with *Tiphha*) Is. 32, 11; יָרָשָׁה Deut. 33, 23. But also without the pause we find מִשְׁמָחָה Is. 32, 11; מְלוּכָה Jud. 9, 8 *Keth.* and צְרוּפָה Ps. 26, 2 *Keth.*, on which see § 46. e.

k The shortened imperative is found only in verbs ל'ָ, e.g. in *Piel* נָלַ from נָלַה. The shade of meaning conveyed by the imperatives with הַ is not always so perceptible as in the cohortative forms of the imperfect, but the longer form is frequently emphatic, e.g. קוּם *rise up*, קוּםָה *up! give, give up!*

l Rem. The form דִּעָה for דִּעָה, accepted in Prov. 24, 14 by the best authorities, is evidently due to the influence of the הַ (h) which follows it in close connexion, and is therefore analogous to the cases discussed in § 22. c, and § 37. d, of an *a* passing into *Sghol*; for other examples of the kind, see above, letter d, § 73. d, and § 80. i. On the other hand, it is doubtful whether רָצָה Jud. 9, 29 (from

¹ On the reading שְׁמָרָה (i.e. šdm'rd, according to the Jewish grammarians), required by the Masora in Ps. 86, 2. 119, 167 (cf. also Is. 38, 14, and שְׁמָרָה Ps. 16, 1), see § 9. v; on מְלוּכָה, Jud. 9, 8 *Keth.*, see § 46. e.

הַיָּדָה is intended for הַיָּדָה, and not rather for the common form of the imperative *Pi'il* הַיָּדָה. In favour of the former explanation it may be urged that the imperative הַיָּדָה (from הַיָּדָה) follows immediately after; in favour of the latter, that the ending הַיָּדָה, with imperatives of verbs הַיָּדָה, is not found elsewhere, and also that here no guttural follows (as in Prov. 24, 14).

§ 49. *The Perfect and Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.*

1. The use of the two tense-forms, as is shown more fully in the *a* Syntax (§§ 106, 107, comp. above, § 47, note on letter *a*), is by no means restricted to the expression of the past or future. One of the most striking peculiarities in the Hebrew consecution of tenses¹, is the phenomenon that, in representing a series of past events, only the first verb stands in the perfect, and the narration is continued in the imperfect. Conversely, the representation of a series of future events begins with the imperfect, and is continued in the perfect. Thus in 2 Ki. 20, 1, *In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death* (perf.), and *Isaiah . . . came* (imperf.) *to him, and said* (imperf.) *to him, &c.* On the other hand, Is. 7, 17, *the Lord shall bring* (imperf.) *upon thee . . . days, &c.*; 18, *and it shall come to pass* (perf. הַיָּדָה) *in that day . . .*

This progress in the sequence of time, is regularly indicated by *b* a pregnant and (called *wāw consecutive*)², which in itself is really only a variety of the ordinary *wāw copulative*, but which sometimes (in the

¹ The other Semitic languages do not exhibit this peculiarity, excepting the Phœnician, the most closely related to Hebrew, and of course the Moabitish dialect of the *Mēša* inscription, which is practically identical with Old Hebrew.

² This name best expresses the prevailing syntactical relation, for by *wāw consecutive* an action is always represented as the direct, or at least temporal consequence of a preceding action. Moreover, it is clear from the above examples, that the *wāw consecutive* can only be thus used in immediate conjunction with the verb. As soon as *wāw*, owing to an insertion (e.g. a negative), is separated from the verb, the imperfect follows instead of the perfect consecutive, the perfect instead of the imperfect consecutive. The fact that whole Books (Lev., Num., Josh., Jud., Sam., 2 Kings, Ezek., Ruth, Esth., Neh., 2 Chron.) begin with the imperfect consecutive, and others (Exod., 1 Kings, Ezra) with *wāw copulative*, is taken as a sign of their close connexion with the historical Books now or originally preceding them. Compare, on the other hand, the independent beginning of Job and Daniel. It is a merely superficial description to call the *wāw consecutive* by the old-fashioned name *wāw converse*, on the ground that it always converts the respective tenses into their opposites, i.e., according to the old view, the future into the preterite, and vice versa.

imperf.) appears with a different vocalization. Further, the tenses connected by *wāw consecutive* sometimes undergo a change in the tone and consequently are liable also to other variations.

- c 2. The *wāw consecutive of the imperfect* is (a) pronounced with *Pathah* and a *Dageš forte* in the next letter, as וַיִּקְטֹל and he killed; before ה of the 1st pers. sing. (according to § 22. 1) with *Qameṣ*, as וַיִּקְטֹל and I killed. Exceptions are, וַיִּכְרַם Ezek. 16, 10 according to the *Diqduq ha-f'amim*, § 71; also וַיִּבְרַח 2 Sam. 1, 10 according to Qimḥi; but in Jud. 6, 9 וַיִּבְרַח should be read according to Baer, and וַיִּבְרַח in both places in Jud. 20, 6. *Dageš forte* is always omitted in the preformative ו, in accordance with § 20. m.

d (b) When a shortening of the imperfect form is possible (comp. § 48. g), it takes effect, as a rule (but cf. § 51. n), after *wāw consec.*, e.g. in Hiphil וַיִּקְטֹל (§ 53. n). The tendency to retract the tone from the final syllable¹ is even stronger after *wāw consec.* than in the jussive. The throwing back of the tone on to the penultima (conditional upon its being an open syllable with a long vowel, § 29. a), further involves the greatest possible shortening of the vowel of the ultima, since the vowel then comes to stand in a toneless closed syllable, e.g. וַיִּשָּׂא, juss. וַיִּשָּׂא, with *wāw consec.* וַיִּשָּׂא and he arose (§ 67. n and x, § 68. d, § 69. p, § 71, § 72. t and aa, § 73. c)².

e In the 1st pers. sing. alone the retraction of the tone and even the reducing of the long vowel in the final syllable (ä to ô, ī to ē) are not usual³, and the apocope in verbs וִי occurs more rarely; e.g. always וַיִּשָּׂא (or וַיִּשָּׂא, a merely orthographic difference), and I arose, Hiph. וַיִּשָּׂא : וַיִּשָּׂא and I saw, more frequently than וַיִּשָּׂא, § 75. t. On the other hand, the form with final הִי is often used in the 1st pers. both sing. and plur., especially in the later Books, e.g. וַיִּשְׁלַח and I sent, Gen. 32, 6. 41, 11. 43, 21. Jud. 6, 9. 10. 1 Sam. 2, 28. 28, 15. 2 Sam. 22, 24. Ps. 3, 6. 7, 5. 90, 10. 119, 55. Job 1, 15 sqq. Ezra 7, 28. 8, 25. 9, 3. Neh. 2, 13. 5, 7. 8. 13. 6, 11. 13, 7-11. 21 sqq., &c.—

¹ Compare, however, above, note on § 48. f.

² The plural forms in וִי also occur less frequently after *wāw consecutive*; comp., however, וַיִּבְרַח Jud. 8, 1. 11, 18. Am. 6, 3. Ezek. 44, 8. Deut. 4, 11. 5, 20. The 2nd fem. sing. in וִי never occurs after *wāw consecutive*.

³ In the 1st plur. וַיִּשְׁלַח Neh. 4, 3 is the only instance in which the vowel remains unreduced (comp. וַיִּשְׁלַח, i. e. וַיִּשְׁלַח, 4, 9 *Keth.*; וַיִּשְׁלַח). On the treatment of the tone in the imperfect, imperative, and infinitive *Niph'al*, see § 51. n.

Sometimes, as in Ps. 3, 6, not without a certain emphasis of expression. In Is. 8, 2 אֶמְצִיחָהּ may have been originally intended; in Ps. 73, 16 חָמָה and in Job 30, 26 חָמָה.

This ׀ is in meaning a strengthened *wāw copulative*, and resembles in pronunciation the form which is retained in Arabic as the ordinary copula (*wā*)¹. The close connexion of this *wā* with the following consonant, caused the latter in Hebrew to take Dageš, especially as *ā* could not have been retained in an open syllable. Comp. בָּמָה, בָּמָה, בָּמָה (for בָּמָה), where the prepositions בִּ and לְ, and the particle בְּ, are closely connected with מָה in the same way.

The retraction of the tone also occurs in such combinations, as in מָהָה (for מָהָה, § 102. f).—The coincidence of many *consecutive* forms with jussives of the same conjugation, must not mislead us into supposing an intimate relation between the moods. In the consecutive forms the shortening of the vowel (and the retraction of the tone) seems rather to be occasioned solely by the strengthening of the preformative syllable, while in the jussives the shortening (and retraction) belongs to the character of the form².

3. The counterpart of *wāw consecutive* of the *imperfect*, is *wāw consecutive of the perfect*, by means of which perfects are placed as the sequels in the future to preceding actions or events regarded as incomplete at the time of speaking, and therefore in the imperfect, imperative, or even participle. This *wāw* is in form an ordinary *wāw copulative*, and therefore shares its various vocalization (וְ, וֹ, וּ, as a Ki. 7, 4, and וֹ); e.g. וְהָיָה, after an imperfect, &c., and so it happens = and it will happen. It has, however, the effect, in certain verbal forms, of shifting the tone from the penultima, generally on to the ultima, e.g. וְהָלַכְתִּי I went, consecutive form וְהָלַכְתִּי and I will go, Jud. 1, 3, where it is co-ordinated with another *perfect consecutive*, which again is the consecutive to an *imperative*; וְהָבְדִּילָהּ, consecutive וְהָבְדִּילָהּ and it shall divide, Ex. 26, 33, but this removing of the tone from an *ā* in the second syllable in *Hiph'il*, as well as in the *perf. Qal* of verbs אָהַב (see below, letter *h*), is exceptional; comp. § 53. r. See further on this usage in § 112.

As the first of the above examples shows, the *Qameṣ* of the first syllable is retained in the strong *perf. consec. Qal*, as formerly before the tone, so now in the

¹ In use the Hebrew *wāw* does duty for the Arabic *fā* as well as *wā*, on which see further in the Syntax.

² The opinion of earlier grammarians (shared by De Lagarde in *Uebersicht über die ... Bildung der Nomina*, p. 213), that וְהָקַטַל arose by contraction from וְהָהּ הָקַטַל (= וְהָהּ) it happened (that) he killed, is as untenable as the derivation from וְהָהּ הָקַטַל.

secondary tone, and therefore necessarily takes *Metheg*. On the other hand, the δ of the second syllable in verbs *middle o* upon losing the tone becomes δ , e.g. וַיִּכְלֹם Ex. 18, 23.

k The shifting forward of the tone after the *wāw consecutive* of the *perfect*, is however not consistently carried out. It is omitted—(a) always in the 1st *pers. pl.*, e.g. וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ Gen. 34, 16; (b) generally (especially in *Qal*) in verbs ל' and ל' , e.g. Ex. 17, 6. 26, 4. 6. 7. 10 sqq. Lev. 19, 14. 32. 25, 17. 36. 43. Is. 14, 4. Jer. 29, 14. Joel 4, 21. Ps. 19, 14, also regularly in *Hiph'il* before the affirmatives ה and ו (cf. § 53. *r*), and always in the 1st *sing.* of verbs ל' (but cf. וַיִּקְרָא , Jer. 2, 2, &c.)¹.

l But before a following נ the ultima mostly bears the tone on phonetic grounds, e.g. וַיִּבְרָא Gen. 6, 18. Ex. 3, 18. Zech. 6, 10 (by the side of וַיִּבְרָא etc. (comp., however, וַיִּקְרָא , before נ , Gen. 17, 19. Jer. 7, 27. Ezek. 36, 29); וַיְהִי Jud. 6, 16, cf. Lev. 24, 5 (but also וַיְהִי Lev. 25, 21). Likewise, before ע , e.g. וַיִּהְיֶה 2 Sam. 15, 33 (comp., however, וַיִּקְרָא Ezek. 33, 21); on verbs ע"ע , see § 67. *k* and *ee*.

(c) The tone always keeps its place when such a perfect stands in *pause*, e.g. וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ Deut. 11, 16; וַיִּמְרֹתוּ Is. 14, 4. Jud. 4, 8; sometimes even in the lesser pause, as Deut. 2, 28. Ezek. 3, 26. 1 Sam. 29, 8 (where see Driver), with *Zaqeph qaton*; and frequently also immediately before a tone-syllable (according to § 29. *e*), as in וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ Deut. 17, 14, comp. 23, 13; Ezek. 14, 13. 17, 22. Amos 1, 4. 7. 10. 12—but also וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ Deut. 21, 11. 23, 14. 24, 19.

§ 50. The Participle.

a 1. *Qal* has both an active participle, called *Pā'āl* from its form (פָּעֹל), and a passive, *Pā'al* (פָּעוּל).

Pā'āl is generally regarded as a survival of a passive of *Qal*, which still exists throughout in Arabic, but has been lost in Hebrew (see, however, § 52. *e*), just as in Aramaic the passives of *Pā'āl* and *Hiph'il* are lost, except in the participles. But the form פָּעֹל is also used actively (see letter *f*), and instances of the form *quṭṭāl* are better regarded as remnants of the passive participle *Qal* (see § 52. *s*), so that פָּעֹל must be considered as an original verbal noun; cf. Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 173 sqq.

b 2. In the *intransitive verbs mid. e* and *mid. o*, the form of the participle active of *Qal* coincides in form (according to § 44. *a*, note 3) with the 3rd sing. of the perfect, e.g. יָשָׁן *sleeping*, from יָשָׁן ; יָרָה (only orthographically different from the perf. יָרָה) *fearing*; comp. the formation of the participle in *Niph'al*, § 51. *a*. On the other hand, the participle of verbs *mid. a* takes the form קָטַל (so even from the

¹ The irregularity in the tone of these perfects manifestly results from following conflicting theories, not that of Ben Ašer alone.

transitive נִשְׁפָּל *to hale*, part. נִשְׁפָּל). The *δ* of these forms has arisen through an obscuring of the *δ*, and is therefore unchangeable, comp. § 9. *q*. The form נִשְׁפָּל (with a changeable *Qameṣ* in both syllables), which would correspond to the forms נִשְׁפָּל and נִשְׁפָּל, is only in use as a noun, comp. § 84. *a*, 3. The formation of the participle in *Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hithpa'el* follows a different method.

8. Participles form their feminine (נִשְׁפָּלָה or נִשְׁפָּלָה) and their plural *c* like other nouns (§ 80, § 84. *a*, Nos. 13, 15, § 94).

Rem. 1. From the above it follows, that the *ā* of the form נִשְׁפָּל is lengthened *d* from *δ*, and consequently changeable (e.g. fem. נִשְׁפָּלָה); and that the *δ* of נִשְׁפָּל on the other hand is weakened from an unchangeable *δ*. In Arabic the verbal adjective of the form *qāṭil* corresponds to the form *qāṭil*, and the part. *qāṭil* to *qāṭil*. In both cases, therefore, the *ē* of the second syllable is lengthened from *ī*, and is consequently changeable (e.g. נִשְׁפָּל, plur. נִשְׁפָּלִים; נִשְׁפָּר, constr. pl. נִשְׁפָּרִי).

תוֹשִׁיץ Ps. 16, 15, instead of the form *qōṭil*, is an anomaly; it is possible, *e* however, that תוֹשִׁיץ (incorrectly written fully) is intended (comp. כְּבִיב 2 Ki. 8, 21), or even the *imperfect Hiph'il* of תוֹשִׁיץ. The form יוֹסִיף, which in Is. 29, 14, 38, 5. Eccles. 1, 18 appears to be a partic. (for יוֹסִיף), is better explained in all these places as the 3rd sing. *imperf. Hiph.* (comp. for the construction Is. 28, 16); אֹבְדִיל 1 Chron. 27, 30, being a proper name and a foreign word, need not be considered.—אֲבִיר (constr. state of אֲבִיר), with *ā* in the second syllable, occurs in Deut. 32, 28 (comp. moreover, § 65. *d*). On הוֹלֵם Is. 41, 7 (for הוֹלֵם), see § 29. *f*.

2. A *Pā'āl* is sometimes formed even from *intransitive verbs*, which properly do not admit of a passive. It then denotes an inherent quality, e.g. מְאֵשׁ *desperate*, Jer. 15, 18, &c.; בְּטוּחַ *trustful*, Is. 26, 3. Ps. 112, 7; עֲצוּם *strong*; שָׂכֹר *drunken*, Jer. 51, 21; and even from a transitive verb, מְרַחֵם *handling*, Cant. 3, 8; נְכוֹר *mindful*, Ps. 103, 14; comp. § 84. *a*, No. 9.

B. VERBA DERIVATIVA, OR DERIVED CONJUGATIONS.

§ 51. Niph'al¹.

1. The characteristic of this conjugation consists essentially in a prefix² to the stem. This probably from the first had two forms: (a) the prepositive; *nā*, as in the Hebrew perfect, although in the strong verb the *ā* is always attenuated to *ī*: נִקְטַל for the original *nā-qāṭāl*, participle נִקְטָל, infinitive absolute sometimes נִקְטֹל; (b) the

¹ Comp. A. Rieder, *De linguae Hebr. verbis, quae vocantur derivata nifal et hitpael*, Gumbinnen (Progr. des Gymn.), 1884, a list of all the strong Niph'al forms (81) and Hithpa'el forms (36) in the Old Testament.

² See Philippi in *ZDMG*. 1886, p. 650, and Barth, *ibid.* 1894, p. 8 sq.

proclitic *in*, as in all the forms of the corresponding Arabic conjugation VII. *inqāṭālā*; in Hebrew *hin*, as in the imperfect *יִקְטֹל* (for *y^hhin-qāṭēl* with syncope of the ה, and assimilation of the נ), in the imperative and infinitive construct *הִקְטֵל* (for *hinqāṭēl*), and in the infinitive absolute *הִקְטֵל*. The inflexion of *Niph'al* is perfectly analogous to that of Qal.

- b* The features of *Niph'al* are accordingly in the perfect and participle the prefixed *Nām*, in the imperative, infinitive, and imperfect, the *Dageš* in the first radical. These characteristics hold good also for the weak verb. In the case of an initial guttural, which, according to § 22. *b*, cannot take *Dageš forte*, the omission of the doubling invariably causes the lengthening of the preceding vowel (see § 63. *k*).
- c* 2. As regards its meaning, *Niph'al* bears some resemblance to the Greek *middle voice*, in being—(a) primarily *reflexive* of Qal, e.g. *נִלְחַם* *to thrust oneself (against)*, *נִשְׁמַר* *to take heed to oneself*, *φυλάσσεσθαι*, *נִסְתַּר* *to hide oneself*, *נִגְאָל* *to redeem oneself*; comp. also *נִעֲנֶה* *to answer for oneself*. Equally characteristic of *Niph'al* is its frequent use to express emotions which react upon the mind; *נָחַם* *to trouble oneself*, *נִאֲנַח* *to sigh (to bemoan oneself)*, comp. *ὀδύρεσθαι*, *lamentari*, *contristari*; as well to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself, or to have an effect upon himself (*Niph'al tolerativum*), e.g. *דָּרַשׁ* *to search, to inquire*, Niph. *to allow oneself to be inquired of*, Is. 65, 1. Ezek. 14, 3 and elsewhere; *נִמְצָא* *to find*, Niph. *to allow oneself to be found*, Is. 65, 1, &c.; *נִנְדָּר* *to allow oneself to be admonished, or warned*; so the Niph. of *יָסַר* *to warn, to correct*, Jer. 6, 8. 31, 18, &c.
- d* (b) It expresses *reciprocal* or *mutual action*, e.g. *דִּבְּרָה* *to speak*, Niph. *to speak to one another*; *שָׁפַט* *to judge*, Niph. *to go to law with one another*; *יָצַע* *to counsel*, Niph. *to take counsel*, comp. the middle and deponent verbs *βουλευέσθαι* (*βούλει*), *μάχεσθαι* (*νίχη*), *altercari*, *luctari* (*ἀντιμαχεύεσθαι* *to strive with one another*) *proeliari*.
- e* (c) It has also, like *Hithpa'el* (§ 54. *f*) and the Greek *middle*, the meaning of the active, with the addition of *to oneself (sibi)*, *for oneself*, e.g. *שָׁאַל* *to ask (something) for oneself* (1 Sam. 20, 6. 28. Neh. 13, 6), comp. *αἰτοῦμαι σε τοῦτο*, *ἐνδύσασθαι χιτῶνα*, *to put on (oneself) a tunic*.
- f* (d) In consequence of a looseness of thought at an early period of the language, *Niph'al* comes finally in many cases to represent the *passive*¹ of Qal, e.g. *יָלַד* *to bear*, Niph. *to be born*; *קָבַר* *to bury*, Niph.

¹ Comp. Halfmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, 1. St.,

to be buried. In cases also where *Qal* is intransitive in meaning, or is not used, *Niph'al* appears as the passive of *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il*, e.g. *בָּכַר* *to be in honour*, *Pi'el to honour*, *Niph. to be honoured* (as well as *Pu'al* *בִּכְר*); *פָּחַד* *Pi'el to conceal*, *Hiph. to destroy*, *Niph. passive of either*. In such cases *Niph'al* may again coincide in meaning with *Qal* (*הָלַךְ* *Qal and Niph. to be ill*) and even take an accusative.

Examples of denominatives are, *נָכַר* *to be born a male*, Ex. 34, 19 (from *נָכַר*; *g* but perhaps *הָנָכַר* should here be read); *לָפַב* *cordatum fieri*, Job 11, 12 (from *לָב* *cor*); doubtless also *נָבְנָה* *to obtain children*, Gen. 16, 2. 30, 3.

The older grammarians were decidedly wrong in representing *Niph'al* simply as *h* the passive of *Qal*; for *Niph'al* has, (as the frequent use of its imperat. shows,) in no respect the character of the other passives, and in Arabic a special conjugation (*'ingdāla*) corresponds to it with a passive of its own. Moreover, not only do the forms mentioned in § 52. *e* point to a differently formed passive of *Qal*, but even a passive of *Niph'al* itself appears to occur in the form *יִנְאֵלוּ* Is. 59, 3. Lam. 4, 14, although König prefers to regard it as a *forma mixta*, in the sense that the punctuators intended to indicate also the possibility of another reading, *יִנְאֵלוּ*, the imperf. *Pu'al* [cf. also Wright, *Compar. Gramm.*, p. 224]. Although the use of *Niph'al* as a passive was introduced at an early period, and became tolerably common, it is nevertheless quite secondary to the reflexive use¹.

Rem. 1. The *infin. absol.* *נִקְטָלוּ* is connected in form with the perfect, to which it bears the same relation as *קָטַל* to *קָטַל* in *Qal*, the *h* in the second syllable being weakened from an original *h*. Examples are, *נִכְכְּבוּ* Gen. 31, 30; *נִלְחָמוּ* Jud. 11, 25; *נִשְׂאֵלוּ* 1 Sam. 20, 6. 28, all in connexion with the perfect.

Examples of the form *הִקְטַל* (in connexion with imperfects) are, *הִנְחָתוּ* Jer. 32, 4; *הִמְאֵלוּ* Lev. 7, 18; once *הִמְאֵלוּ* Ezek. 14, 3, where, perhaps, the subsequent *הִמְאֵלוּ* has led to the corruption of *ה* for *ה*.—Moreover, the form *הִקְטַל* is not infrequently used also for the *infin. absol.*², e.g. Ex. 22, 3. Num. 15, 31. Deut. 4, 26. 1 Ki. 20, 39. On the other hand, for the wholly abnormal *הִקְטַל* Ps. 68, 3 (commonly explained as being intended to correspond in sound with the subsequent *הִקְטַל*, but probably a 'forma mixta,' combining the readings *הִקְטַל* and *הִקְטַל*), should simply be read.

Wittenb., 1888, 2. St. 1892 (Gymn.-Programm), statistics of the *Niph'al* (*Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and *qātūl*) forms at different periods of the language, for the purpose of ascertaining the meaning of *Niph.* and its relation to the passive; the selection of periods is, however, very questionable from the standpoint of literary criticism.

¹ In other languages, also, this transition from reflexive to passive may be observed. Thus in Sanskrit and Greek it is still easy to see how the middle precedes the passive form.

² But, like *הִקְטַל*, only in connexion with imperfects. Barth is therefore right in describing (*Nominalbildung*, p. 74) both forms as later analogous formations (in addition to the original Semitic *נִקְטָלוּ*), intended to assimilate the infinitive to the imperfect which it strengthens.

- l Syncope of the ה after prepositions is required by the Masora in *בְּבִשְׁלֵי* Prov. 24, 17 (for *בְּהִפְּ*), *בְּהִרְגַּנִּי* Ezek. 26, 15 and *בְּעִטְמָה* Lam. 2, 11; also in verbs *לִי* Ex. 10, 3 (*לְעִנּוֹת*); 34, 24 and Is. 1, 12 (*לְרִאיוֹת*); in verbs *וְעַ* Job 33, 30 (*וְעִיר*). It is, however, extremely doubtful whether the *inf. Qal* of the *K'thbbh* is not rather intended in all these examples; it certainly is so in Lam. 2, 11, as appears from comparison with Ps. 61, 3.
- m 2. Instead of the *Sere* in the ultima of the imperfect, the original *Pathah* often occurs in pause, e.g. *וַיִּנְמַל* Gen. 21, 8; comp. Ex. 31, 17. 2 Sam. 12, 15 (with final ש); 17, 23 (with ק); Jon. 1, 5 (with ט); see § 29. q. In the 2nd and 3rd plur. fem. *Pathah* predominates, e.g. *תִּנְכְּרְנָה* Is. 65, 17; *Sere* occurs only in *תִּשְׁעֲנָה* Ruth 1, 13, from *עָנָן*, and hence, with loss of the doubling, for *תִּשְׁעֲנָה*; comp. even *תִּמְצִינָה* Is. 60, 14.—With *Nām paragogicum* (see § 47. m) in the 2nd and 3rd plur. masc. are found, *יִכְבְּדוּן*, *תִּפְחֲמוּן*, &c., in pause *יִבְהֲלוּן*, *תִּשְׁמְדוּן*, &c.; but Job 19, 24 (comp. 24, 24) *יִהְיֶה צָרוֹן*.
- n 3. When the imperfect, the infinitive (in *z*), or the imperative is followed in close connexion by a monosyllable, or by a word with the tone on the first syllable, the tone is, as a rule (but cf. *וַיֵּאבֶק אִישׁ* Gen. 32, 25), shifted back from the ultima to the penultima, while the ultima, which thus loses the tone, takes *S'ghol* instead of *Sere*; e.g. *וַיִּשְׁלַח בָּהּ* Ezek. 33, 12; *וַיַּעֲזֹר לוֹ* Gen. 25, 21; in the imperative, 13, 9.—So always *לֵךְ הִשְׁמֵר לָךְ* (since *לָךְ* counts as *one* syllable) Gen. 24, 6, &c., comp. 1 Sam. 19, 2; and even with *Pathah* in the ultima, *תִּעֲבֹב אֶרֶץ* Job 18, 4 (but comp. *וַיַּעֲזֹר אֱלֹהִים* 2 Sam. 21, 14). Although in isolated cases (e.g. Gen. 32, 25. Ezra 8, 23) the tone is not thrown back, in spite of a tone-syllable following, the retraction has become general in certain forms, even when the next word begins with a toneless syllable; especially after *consec.*, e.g. *וַיִּשְׁאָר* Gen. 7, 25; *וַיִּפְחֹם* Num. 21, 1 and elsewhere frequently, *וַיִּצְמֹד* 25, 3; and always so in the imperative *הִשְׁמֵר* Ex. 23, 21. Job 36, 21, and (before Metheg of the counter-tone) Deut. 24, 8. 2 Ki. 6, 9. On the avoidance of pausal-forms in the imperative (Zech. 2, 11), and imperfect (Prov. 24, 4, &c.), see § 29. o, and note; on the other hand, always *וַיִּפְחֹם*, &c.
- o In the imperative, *וַיִּקְבְּצוּ*, with the rejection of the initial ה, occurs in Ps. 43, 9 (Joel 4, 11 in pause *וַיִּקְבְּצוּ*; comp. *וַיִּקְבְּצוּ* Jer. 50, 5) for *וַיִּקְבְּצוּ*; but in all these examples either the reading or the explanation is doubtful. With ה—*paragogicum*, *וַיִּשְׁבַּע הַשְׁבַּעָה לִּי* swear unto me, Gen. 21, 23, &c.
- p 4. For the 1st sing. of the imperfect, the form *אֶשְׁמַל* is as frequent as *אֶשְׁמַל*, e.g. *אֶשְׁמַל* I shall be inquired of, Ezek. 14, 3; *אֶשְׁבַּע* I will swear, Gen. 21, 24; cf. 16, 2. Num. 23, 15. Ezek. 20, 36, and so always in the cohortative, e.g. *אֶנְקָמָה* I will avenge me, Is. 1, 44; comp. 1 Sam. 12, 7. Ezek. 26, 2, and see § 69. t. The Babylonian punctuation only admits *t* under the preformative of the 1st person.

§ 52. *Pi'el and Pu'al.*

- a 1. The *characteristic* of this conjugation consists in the doubling of the middle radical. From the simple stem *qafal* (comp. § 43. d) the

form **פָּעַל** (comp. the Arabic conj. II. *qāl/ālā*) would naturally follow as the *perfect* of the active (*Pi'el*). The *Pathah* of the first syllable is, however, with one exception (see letter *m*), always attenuated to *i* in the perfect. In the second syllable, *ā* has been retained in the majority of cases, so that the conjugation should more correctly be called *Pi'al*; but very frequently¹ this *ā* also is attenuated to *i*, which is then regularly lengthened to *ē*, under the influence of the tone. Comp. in Aram. **פָּעַל**; but in Biblical Aramaic almost always **פָּעַל**. On the three cases in which *ā* before a final **ר** or **ד** has passed into *Sghól*, see below, letter *l*.—Hence, for the 3rd *sing. masc. perfect*, there arise forms like **אָבַר**, **לָבַר**, **קָדַשׁ**; **בָּנַר**, **נָדַר**, &c.—Before affirmatives beginning with a consonant, however, *ā* is always retained, thus **קָטַל**, **קָטַלְתָּ**, **קָטַלְתָּ**, &c. In the *infinitives* (*absol.* **פָּעַל**, obscured from *qāṭil*; *constr.* **פָּעַל**), *imperfect* (**פָּעַלְתָּ**), and *participle* (**פָּעַלְתָּ**) the original *ā* of the first syllable reappears throughout. The vocal *Swd* of the preformatives is weakened from a short vowel; comp. the Arabic imperfect *yūqāṭil*, participle *mūqāṭil*.

The *passive* (*Pu'al*) is distinguished by the obscure vowel *ū*, or very rarely *ō*, in the first syllable, and *ā* (in pause *ā*) always in the second. In Arabic, also, the passives are formed throughout with *ū* in the first syllable. The inflexion of both these conjugations is otherwise analogous to that of *Qal*.

Rem. 1. The preformative **וּ**, which in the remaining conjugations also is the prefix of the participle, is probably connected with the *interrogative* or *indefinite* (comp. § 37) pronoun **וּ** *quis? quicunque* (fem. **וּ**); comp. § 85, No. 48.

2. The *Dageš forte*, which according to the above is characteristic of the whole of *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*, is often omitted (independently of verbs *middle guttural*, § 64. *d*) when the middle radical has *Swd* under it (comp. § 20. *m*), e.g. **שָׁחַח** for **שָׁחַח** Ezek. 17, 7; **בָּקִשׁוּ** 2 Chron. 15, 15 (but in the *imperative* always **בָּקִשׁוּ** 1 Sam. 28, 7, &c.), and so always in **הִלְלוּ** *praise!* The vocal character of the *Swd* under the *littera dagessanda* is sometimes in such cases (according to § 10. *h*) expressly emphasized by its taking the form of a *Haṭeph*, as in **הִלְלֵה** Gen. 2, 23, with **וּ** owing to the influence of the preceding *u*, comp. **הִלְלֵה** for **הִלְלֵה**, &c.; Gen. 9, 14. Jud. 16, 16. In the *imperfect* and *participle* the *Swd* under the preformatives (*Haṭeph-Pathah* under **וּ** in the 1st *sing. imperfect*) serves at the same time as a characteristic of both conjugations.

¹ In all verbs which end in *Nun*, and in almost all which end in *Lamed* (Olsh. p. 538). Barth is probably right in supposing (*ZDMG*. 1894, p. 1 sqq.) that the vowels of the strengthened perfects have been influenced by the *imperfect*.

e 3. According to the valuable suggestion of Böttcher (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, § 904 sqq. and § 1022¹), many supposed perfects of *Pu'al* are in reality passives of Qal. He reckons as such all those perfects, of which the *Pi'el* (which ought to express the corresponding active) is either not found at all, or only (as in the case of יָלַד) with a different meaning, and which form their imperfect from another conjugation, generally Niph'al. Such perfects are the *qattāl* form of the stems שָׁנַל, עָבַד, לָקַח, יָצַר, יָלַד, מָרַף, חָפַשׁ, Is. i, 20, אָכַל (imperfect הִתְאַכֵּל Is. i, 20), שָׁפַף, שָׁטַף. Barth (see below) adds to the list the apparent *Pu'al*-perfects of אָסַר, בָּזַח, זָנַח, חָצַב, כָּרַת, נָפַח, עָוָה, עָשָׂה, רָאָה, and of verbs with middle ר (hence with *ā* of the first syllable lengthened to *ō*), הָרַג, הָרַח, הָרַן, טָרַף, זָרַק, זָרַע, הָרַה, הָרַג, שָׁרַף; also the infinitives absolute הָרַו הָלַו Is. 59, 13. In these cases there was no need to assume any error on the part of the punctuators; the sharpening of the second radical may have taken place in order to retain the characteristic *ā* of the first syllable (comp. Arab. *qattālā* as passive of *qātālā*), and the *a* of the second syllable would be in accordance with the vocalization of all the other passives (see § 39. f). Comp. § 52. s and § 53. u.

f 2. The fundamental idea of *Pi'el*, to which all the various shades of meaning in this conjugation may be referred, is, to busy oneself eagerly with the action indicated by the stem. This intensifying of the idea of the stem, which is outwardly expressed by the sharpening of the first syllable, appears in individual cases as—(a) a *strengthening* and *repetition* of the action (comp. the *intensive* and *iterative* nouns with the middle radical doubled, § 84. b)², e.g. צָחַק *to laugh*, *Pi'el to jest, to make sport* (to laugh repeatedly); שָׁאַל *to ask*, *Pi'el to beg*; hence when an action has reference to *many*, e.g. קָבַר *to bury* (a person) Gen. 23, 4, *Pi'el to bury* (many) 1 Ki. 11, 15, and often so in Syr. and Arab. Other modifications of the *intensive* or *iterative* meaning are, e.g. פָּתַח *to open*, *Pi'el to loose*; סָפַר *to count*, *Pi'el to recount*: [cf. חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב; חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב, חָשַׁב].

¹ As Mayer Lambert observes, the same view was already expressed by Ibn Ġanāḥ (see above, § 3. d) in the *Kitāb el-luma'*, p. 161. Cf. especially Barth, 'Das passive Qal und seine Participien,' in the *Festschrift zum Jubiläum Hildesheimer* (Berlin, 1890), p. 145 sqq.

² Analogous examples, in which the doubling of a letter has likewise an *intensive* force, are such German words as *reichen*, *recken* (Eng. *to reach*, *to rack*); *streichen* (*stringo*), *strecken*; comp. *strich* (*a stroke*), *strecke* (*a stretch*); *wacker* from *wachen*; others in which it has the *causative* sense, are *stechen*, *stecken*; *wachen*, *wecken*; τέλλω *to bring to an end* (comp. the stem τέλω *to end*, in τέλος, τελέω); γινάσκω *to beget*, from the stem γένω *to come into being* (comp. γένος). The above examples also show that in German when the *ck* is doubled, in consequence of the preceding diphthong becoming a short vowel, it takes the form of *kk* (*ck*); similarly in Hebrew, according to § 13. 3, an aspirated *B^gadk^{ph}ath* letter, when doubled, necessarily becomes a *tenuis*.

The eager pursuit of an action may also consist in urging and *g* causing others to do the same. Hence *Pi'el* has also—(b) a *causative* sense (like *Hiph'il*), e.g. *לָמַד* to learn, *Pi'el* to teach. It may often be turned by such phrases as *to permit to, to declare or hold as* (the *declarative Pi'el*), *to help to*, e.g. *חָיָה* to cause to live, *פָּדָה* to declare innocent, *יָלַד* to help in child-bearing.

(c) *Denominatives* (see § 38. b) are frequently formed in this conjuga- *h* tion, and generally express a being occupied with the object expressed by the noun, either to form or to make use of it, e.g. *בָּנָה* to make a nest, to nest (from *בֵּן*), *פָּעַר* to throw dust, to dust (from *פֶּעַר*), *עָנָן* to gather the clouds together (from *עָנָן*), *שָׁלַשׁ* to divide in three parts, or to do a thing for the third time (from *שָׁלֹשׁ*); probably also *דִּבֶּר* to speak, from *דָּבָר* a word. Or again, the denominative may express *taking away, injuring, &c.*, the object denoted by the noun (*privative Pi'el*, comp. our *to skin, to behead, to bone*), e.g. *שָׁרַשׁ* from *שָׁרֵץ* to root out, to extirpate, *וָנַב* prop. to injure the tail (*וָנָב*), hence to rout the rear of an army, to set upon it; *לָבַב* to ravish the heart; *רָשָׁן* to remove the ashes (*רָשָׁן*), *חָפַא* to free from sin (*חָטָא*), *עָצַם* to break any one's bones (*עָצָם*); comp., in the same sense, *נָרַם* from *נֶרֶם*; *סָעַף* to lop the boughs, Is. 10, 33 (from *סָעִף* a bough). Some words are clearly denominatives, although the noun from which they are derived is no longer found, e.g. *סָבַל* to stone, to pelt with stones (also used in this sense in *Qal*), and to remove stones (from a field), to clear away stones; comp. our *to stone*, used also in the sense of *taking out the stones* from fruit.

The meaning of the *passive (Pu'al)* follows naturally from the above, e.g. *בִּקְשָׁה*, *Pi'el* to seek, *Pu'al* to be sought.

In *Pi'el* the literal, concrete meaning of the verb has sometimes been retained, *i* when *Qal* has acquired a figurative sense, the former being regarded as the stronger and more striking, e.g. *גָּלָה*, *Pi'el* to uncover, *Qal* to reveal, also to emigrate, i. e. to make the land bare.

Also with an intransitive sense *Pi'el* occurs as an intensive form, but only in poetic language, e.g. *חָתַת* in *Pi'el* to be broken in pieces, Jer. 51, 56; *פָּתַח* to tremble, Is. 51, 13. Prov. 28, 14; *פָּתַח* to be open, Is. 48, 8. 60, 11; *רָהַךְ* to be drunken, Is. 34, 5. 7; [*מָעַט* to be few, Eccl. 12, 3.] *k*

Rem. 1. The (more frequent) form of the perfect with *Pathah* in the second syllable appears especially before *Maggeph* (Eccles. 9, 15. 12, 9) and in the middle of sentences in continuous discourse, but at the end of the sentence (in pause) the form with *Sere* is more common. Comp. *נָדַל* Is. 49, 21 with *נָדַל* Jos. 4, 14. Esth. 3, 1; *מָלַם* Ezek. 33, 5 with *מָלַם* Eccles. 9, 15; *קָצַץ* 2 Ki. 8, 16

with קָטַלְהָ Ps. 129, 4. The 3rd *sing. fem.* in *pause* is always of the form קָטַלְהָ, except קָטַלְהָ Mic. 1, 7; the 3rd plur. always as קָטַלְוּ; the 2nd and 1st *sing.* and 1st *plur.* of course as קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתֶּם (but always קָטַלְתִּי, קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתֶּם). In the 3rd *sing. perf.*, דִּבֶּר, דָּבַר to *speech*, בָּפַר to *pardon*, and בָּבַשׁ to *wash clothes* (also בָּבַשׁ Gen. 49, 11) take *Sghöl*, but become in *pause* דִּבֶּר, בָּפַר, בָּבַשׁ (2 Sam. 19, 25); the *pausal* form of בָּפַר never occurs.

m Pathah in the first syllable (as in Aramaic and Arabic) occurs only once, Gen. 41, 51, נָשַׁחְנִי *he made me forget*, to emphasize more clearly the play on the name מִנְשָׁח.

n 2. In the *imperfect, infinitive, and imperative Pi'el* (as also in *Hithpa'el*) the *Sere* in the final syllable, when followed by *Maqqeph*, is usually shortened into *Sghöl*, e.g. יִבְקֹשׁ לֹא *he seeks for himself*, Is. 40, 20; קִדְּשִׁי *sanctify unto me*, Ex. 13, 2. *Pausal-forms* with *Sghöl* instead of *Sere*, as יִרְחֹק Deut. 32, 11, אֶרְחֹק Hos. 2, 6 (comp. Ex. 32, 6 in the infinitive, and Gen. 21, 9 in the participle), owe their origin to some particular school of Masoretes, and are wrongly accepted by Baer; cf. the analogous cases in § 75. *n* and *hh*. If the final syllable of the *imperfect Pi'el* has Pathah (before a guttural or ר), it remains in *pause*; comp. § 29. *s* and § 65. *e*. In the 1st *sing. imperfect* the *e-sound* occurs in two words for *Haqeph-Pathah*, under the preformative א; אֶזְכֶּרָה Lev. 26, 33. Ezek. 5, 12. 12, 14 and אֶמְשָׁעָם Zech. 7, 14 (in accordance with § 23. *h*).—Before the full plural ending ון (see § 47. *m*) the *Sere* is retained in *pause*, e.g. תִּדְבְּרוּן Ps. 58, 2 (but Gen. 32, 20 תִּדְבְּרוּן), comp. 2 Ki. 6, 19. Deut. 12, 3; so before *Silluq* Ps. 58, 3. Job 21, 11 and even before *Zaqeph galon* Deut. 7, 5. Instead of תִּסְפְּלוּנָה, forms like תִּסְפְּלוּנָה are also found, e.g. Is. 3, 16. 13, 18, in both cases before a sibilant and in *pause*. Also פָּלַן Ps. 55, 10 occurs as the 2nd *sing. imperative* (probably an intentional imitation of the sound of the preceding פָּלַע) and קָרַב (for *garrah*) Ezek. 37, 17.

o 3. The *infinite absolute* of *Pi'el* has sometimes the special form קָטַל given in the paradigm, e.g. יָפַר *castigando*, Ps. 118, 18; comp. Ex. 21, 19. 1 Ki. 19, 10 (from a verb לָפַר); Ps. 40, 2 (from a verb לָפַר); but much more frequently the form of the *infinitive construct* (קָטַל) is used instead. The latter has also, in exceptional cases, the form קָטַל (with *ä* attenuated to *i* as in the *perfect*), e.g. in 1 Chron. 8, 8 שָׁלַח; probably also קָטַר Jer. 44, 21; and for the sake of assonance even for *infinitive absolute* in 2 Sam. 12, 14 (נָאֵץ נָאֵץ). On the other hand, שָׁלַח Deut. 32, 35 and דִּבֶּר Jer. 5, 13 are better regarded as substantives, while דִּבֶּר Ex. 6, 28. Num. 3, 1. Deut. 4, 15 (in each case after בְּיָוִם), Hos. 1, 2 (after תִּחַלֵּת), in all of which places it is considered by König (after Qimhi) to be *infinitive construct*, is really perfect of *Pi'el*.

p The infinitive construct *Pi'el*, with the *fem.* ending, occurs in יִפְרָה Lev. 26, 18; וְיִפְרָה Ps. 147, 1; with ת of the *fem.*, שָׁלַכְתָּ Is. 6, 13; before a suffix וְיִפְרָה Ezek. 16, 52. On the verbal nouns after the form of the Aram. inf. *Pa'ul* (קָטַלְהָ), see § 84*b*, No. 22.

q 4. In *Pu'al* *ä* is sometimes found instead of *u* in the initial syllable, e.g. מִדְּמָה *died red*, Ex. 25, 5 &c. Nah. 2, 4, comp. 3, 7 שָׁדְדָה; Ezek. 16, 4. Ps. 72, 20. 80, 11. According to Baer's reading also in וְיִפְרָה Ps. 62, 4, and so also Ben

Ašer, but Ben Naphtali אשר. It is merely an orthographic licence when *ā* is written fully, e.g. אשר Jud. 18, 29.

5. As *infinitive absolute* of *Pu'al* we find נבב Gen. 40, 15.—No instance of the *inf. constr.* occurs in the strong verb in *Pu'al*.

6. A few examples occur of the *participle Pu'al* without the preformative (פ), s e.g. אכל Ex. 3, 2; ידל (for מיל) Jud. 13, 8; לקח 2 Ki. 2, 10. These *participles* are distinguished from the *perfect* (as in *Niph'al*) by the *ā* of the final syllable. For other examples, see Is. 30, 24. Eccles. 9, 12 (where אקשי, according to § 20. n, stands for ק' = ק'י); but, according to the Masora, *not* Ezek. 26, 17, since הקלה as *Mil'el* can only be the *perfect*. The rejection of the פ might be favoured by an initial מ, as in Is. 18, 2. 7 (but also משק); Prov. 25, 19; so also in the participle *Pi'el* מאן Ex. 7, 27 &c. &c. (always after מ, but cf. also המאנים Jer. 13, 10) and מחר Zeph. 1, 14 (and Is. 8, 1. 3!). Notice, however, Barth's suggestion (*Nominalbildung*, p. 273) that, as the active of forms like אכל only occurs in *Qal*, they are perfect participles of former *passives* of *Qal* (see letter *c*), as Jer. 13, 10, and perfect participles of *Pi'el*, as in Jer. 23, 32.—On מכר Ezek. 45, 2, see § 65. d.

§ 53. Hiph'il and Hoph'al.

1. The characteristic of the active (*Hiph'il*) is a prefixed ה, in the *perfect* ה (with the *ā* attenuated to *i*, as in *Pi'el*), which forms a closed syllable with the first consonant of the stem. The second syllable of the *perfect* had also originally an *ā* (comp. the Arabic conj. iv. *aqlāla*, and in Hebrew the return of the *Pathah* in the 2nd and 1st pers. הקטיל &c.); after the attenuation of this *ā* to *i*, it ought by rule to have been lengthened to *ē* in the tone-syllable, as in Aramaic אקטל, beside הקטל in Biblical Aramaic. Instead of this, however, it is always replaced in the strong verb by *i*¹, י, but sometimes written defectively —; cf. § 9. g.

Similarly in the infinitive construct הקטיל, and in the imperfect and participle יקטיל and מקטיל, which are syncopated from יהקטיל and מיהקטיל; § 23. k. The corresponding Arabic forms (*juqtīl* and *muqtīl*) point to an original *i* in the second syllable of these forms. In Hebrew the regular lengthening of this *i* to *ē* appears in the strong verb, at least in the *jussive* and in the *imperfect consecutive* (see letter *n*), as also in the *imperative* of the 2nd sing. masc. (letter *m*);

¹ This *i* may have been transferred originally from the imperfects of verbs ו'ו, as a convenient means of distinction between the indicative and jussive, to the *imperfect* of the strong verb and afterwards to the whole of *Hiph'il*; so Stade, Philippi, Praetorius, *ZAW.* 1883, p. 52 sq.

on $\text{הִקְטִילָהּ, הִקְטִילָהּ}$ comp. § 26. *p.* On the return of the original \tilde{a} in the second syllable under the influence of a guttural, cf. § 65. *f.*

- b* In the *passive* (*Hoph'al*) the preformative is pronounced with an obscure vowel, whilst the second syllable has \tilde{a} (in pause \bar{a}), as its characteristic, thus:—*Perf.* הִקְטִיל or הִקְטִיל , *Imperf.* יִקְטֹל (syncopated from יִהְיֶה) or יִקְטֹל , *Part.* מִקְטֵל or מִקְטֵל (from מִהְיֶה); but the *infinitive absolute* has the form הִקְטִיל . On the origin of the preformative ה , comp. § 55. *i.*

Thus the characteristics of both conjugations are the ה preformative in the *perfect, imperative and infinitive*; in the *imperfect and participle Hiph'il*, Pathah under the preformatives, in the *Hoph'al* δ or \tilde{a} .

- c* 2. The signification of *Hiph'il* is primarily, and even more frequently than in *Pi'el* (§ 52. *g.*), *causative* of *Qal*, e.g. יָצַח to go forth, *Hiph.* to bring forth, to lead forth, to draw forth; קִדְּשׁ to be holy, *Hiph.* to sanctify. Under the *causative* is also included (as in *Pi'el*) the *declarative sense*, e.g. הִצְדִּיק to pronounce just; הִרְשִׁיעַ to make one an evil doer (meaning to pronounce guilty); comp. עָקַשׁ , in *Hiph'il*, Job 9, 20, to represent as perverse. If *Qal* has already a transitive meaning, *Hiph'il* then takes two accusatives (see § 117. *cc.*). In some verbs, *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il* occur side by side in the same sense, e.g. אָבַד *perit*, *Pi'el* and *Hiph'il*, *perdidit*; as a rule, however, only one of these two conjugations is in use, or else they differ from one another in meaning, e.g. כָּבֵד *gravem esse*, *Pi'el* to honour, *Hiph'il* to bring to honour, also to make heavy. Verbs which are intransitive in *Qal* simply become transitive in *Hiph'il*, e.g. $\text{נָחַה$ to bow oneself, *Hiph.* to bow, to bend.

- d* Among the ideas expressed by the *causative* and *transitive* are included, moreover, according to the *Hebrew* point of view (and that of the *Semitic* languages generally, especially *Arabic*), a series of actions and ideas, which we have to express by periphrasis, in order to understand their being represented by the *Hiph'il*-form. To these inwardly transitive or intensive *Hiph'il*s belong: (*a*) *Hiph'il* stems which express the obtaining or receiving of a concrete or abstract quality. (In the following examples the *Qal* stems are given, for the sake of brevity, with the addition of the meaning which—often together with other meanings—belongs to the *Hiph'il*.) Thus $\text{אָהַל, זָהַר, יָפַע, צִיץ}$ to be bright, to shine (to give forth lustre); opposed to חָשַׁךְ to become dark; אָמַץ, נָבַר to be strong (to develop strength), עָמַף to be weak; אָרַךְ to be long (to acquire length); נָבַה to be high; הוּם to be in tumult, זָעַק to cry out, רָוַע to make a noise, to exult; חָלַף to sprout (to put forth shoots), comp. פָּרַח to bloom, עָרַף to overflow; חָרַשׁ to be silent (*silentium facere*).

Pliny) מִתֵּק to be sweet; צָלַח to have success; שָׁפַל to be low; אָדָם to become red, לָבָן to become white.

(b) Stems which express in *Hiph'il* the entering into a certain condition and, further, the being in the same: אָמַן to become firm, to trust in; בָּאֵשׁ to become stinking; זָוַד to become boiling, to boil over; חָלָה to become ill, חָלַם to become healthy; חָסַר to come to want; חָרָה to become hot; יָבֵשׁ to become dry, to become ashamed; יָתַר to attain superiority; סָכַן to become familiar; קָץ, קָץ to become awake; קָשָׁה to become hard; רָנַע, שָׁקַט to become quiet (to keep quiet); שָׁמַם to be astonished. The *Hiph'il* forms of some verbs of motion constitute a variety of this class: נָגַשׁ to draw near, קָרַב to come near; רָחַק to withdraw far off (all these three are besides used as causatives); קָדַם to come before.

(c) Stems which express action in some particular direction: חָטָא to err; חָלַק f to flatter (to act smoothly); יָטַב to act well, to do good; סָכַל to act foolishly, שָׁכַל to act wisely; עָרַם to act craftily; צָנַע to act submissively; רָשַׁע, רָשַׁע to act wickedly, godlessly; שָׁחָה, תָּעַב to act corruptly, shamefully; שָׁלַם to act peacefully, to be at peace, to be submissive.

Further, there are in *Hiph'il* a considerable number of denominatives which g express, the bringing out, the producing of a thing, and so are properly regarded as causatives¹, e.g. אָצַר to set over the treasury, Neh. 13, 13 (unless וְאֶצְוָה is to be read, as in Neh. 7, 2); בָּרַךְ to bring forth a firstborn; גָּשַׁם to cause to rain; זָרַע to produce seed; יָמַן (*Hiph'il* הָיִמִּין) to go to the right, cf. הִשְׁמָאֵל to go to the left; פָּרַס to get or to have hoofs; קָץ to get or to have horns; שָׁכַל to produce abortion; שָׁלַב to become snow-white; שָׁמַן to grow fat, to become fat; שָׁרַשׁ to put forth roots, &c.; so also according to the ordinary acceptance הִאָּזְנוּהוּ Is. 19, 6, they have become stinking, from אָזַן stinking or stench, with retention of the א prosthetic, § 19. m (but see below, letter p).

Of a different kind are the denominatives from: אָזַן (scarcely to prick up the ears, but) to act with the ears, to hear; comp. לָשַׁן to move the tongue, to slander, and the German äugeln (to make eyes), füsseln, nüsseln, schwänzel; שָׁכַר to sell corn; שָׁכַם to set out early (to load the back [of the camel, &c.]?); opposed to הָעֵרִיר.

3. The meaning of *Hoph'al* is (a) primarily that of a passive of *Hiph'il*, e.g. הִשְׁלִיךְ *proiecit*, הִשְׁלָךְ or הִשְׁלָךְ *proiectus est*; (b) sometimes *Hoph'al* also takes the place of a passive of *Qal*, as נָקַם to avenge, *Hoph.* to be avenged (but see below, letter u).

Rem. 1. The *f* of the 3rd sing. masc. perf. *Hiph'il* remains, without exception, i in the 3rd fem. (in the tone-syllable). That it was, however, only lengthened from a short vowel, and consequently is changeable, is proved by the forms of

¹ The same ideas are also paraphrased by the verb עָשָׂה (to make), e.g. to make fat, for, to produce fat upon his body, Job 15, 27; to make fruit, to make branches, for, to put forth, to yield, Job 14, 9. Hos. 8, 7, comp. the Lat. *corpus*, *robur*, *sobolem*, *divitias facere*, and the Ital. *far corpo*, *far forze*, *far frutto*.

the *imperative* and *imperfect* where *ē* (or, under the influence of gutturals, *ā*) takes its place. In an open syllable the *f* is retained almost throughout; only in very isolated instances has it been weakened to *š*^{wd} (see letters *n* and *o*).

- k* 2. The *infinitive absolute* commonly has *šere* without *Yodh*, e.g. הִקְדֵּשׁ Jud. 17, 3; less frequently it takes 'ִ, e.g. הִשְׁמִיד Am. 9, 8; comp. Deut. 15, 14. Is. 59, 4. Jer. 3, 15. 23, 32. 44, 25. Job 34, 35. Eccles. 10, 10. With *š* instead of *h* (probably a mere scribal error, not an Aramaism) we find אֲשַׁכֵּיִם Jer. 25, 3. Rare exceptions, where the form with *šere* stands for the *infinitive construct*, are, e.g. Deut. 32, 8. Jer. 44, 19. 25. Prov. 25, 2. Job 13, 3(?); on the other hand, for הִקְדֵּשׁ Deut. 26, 12 (which looks like an infinitive Hiph'el with syncope of the *h*, for הִקְדֵּשׁ) the right reading is simply הִקְדֵּשׁ, since elsewhere the Pi'el alone occurs with the meaning *to tithe*; for הִקְדֵּשׁ Neh. 10, 39 perhaps the inf. Qal (הִקְדֵּשׁ) was intended, as in 1 Sam. 8, 15. 17 (= *to take the tithe*). At the same time it is doubtful whether the present punctuation does not arise from a combination of two different readings, the Qal and the Pi'el.

- l* Instead of the ordinary form of the *infinitive construct* הִקְטִיל the form הִקְטִיל sometimes occurs, e.g. הִשְׁמִיד *to destroy*, Deut. 7, 24. 28, 48; comp. Lev. 14, 46. Jos. 11, 14. Jer. 50, 34. 51, 33 and הִקְצוּת *for הִקְצוּת* Lev. 14, 43 from קָצַח; scarcely, however, Lev. 7, 35. 2 Sam. 22, 1 (Ps. 18, 1). 1 Ki. 11, 16 (after עָד), and in the passages so explained by König (p. 276) where הִקְטִיל appears after prepositions; [cf. Driver on Deut. 3, 3. 4, 15. 7, 24. 28, 55.]

With *ā* in the second syllable there occurs הִפְרָכָם Ezek. 21, 29 (comp. the substantival infin. הִפְרָךְ 1 Sam. 15, 23).—In the Aram. manner הִשְׁמַעוּת is found in Ezek. 24, 26 (as a construct form) for the *infinitive Hiph'el* (comp. the *infinitive Hithpa'el*, Dan. 11, 23). On the syncope of the *h* after prefixes, see letter *q*.

- m* 3. In the *imperative* the *f* is retained throughout in the open syllable, according to letter *i*, and consequently also before suffixes (see § 61. 2), and הִפְרָךְ *paragoric*, e.g. הִקְשִׁיבָה *attend to* (but in Ps. 118, 25 with the tone at the end, הִפְרָךְ). On the other hand, in the 2nd sing. masc. the original *f* (comp. Arabic *qatl*) is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. הִשְׁמֵן *make fat*, and becomes *š^{ghl}* before *Maqqeph*, e.g. הִסְפִּדְנָא Job 22, 21.—The form הִקְטִיל *for הִקְטִיל* appears anomalously a few times: Ps. 94, 1. Is. 43, 8. Jer. 17, 18 (comp. § 69. *v* and § 72. *y*); elsewhere the Masora has preferred the punctuation הִקְטִיל, e.g. 2 Ki. 8, 6; comp. Ps. 142, 5.—In Lam. 5, 1 הִבִּיטָה is required by the *Q^{rel}* for הִבִּיטָה.

- n* 4. In the *imperfect Hiph'el* the *shorter* form with *šere* prevails for the jussive in the 3rd masc. and fem. and 2nd masc. sing., e.g. אַל תִּהְיֶה *make not great*, Obad. 12; יִכְרֹת *let Him cut off*! Ps. 12, 4; even incorrectly תִּגִּד Ex. 19, 3, and יִגִּד Eccles. 10, 20; comp. also יִכְרֹת Ex. 22, 4, where the jussive form is to be explained according to § 109. *h*, and יִאָּכַר Job 39, 26 before the principal pause. Similarly, after 1 consec., e.g. וַיִּבְדֵּל *and He divided*, Gen. 1, 4. On the other hand, *f* is almost always retained in the 1st sing., e.g. וְאֶשְׁמִיד Am. 2, 9; comp.

¹ As to the doubtfulness, on general grounds, of this form of the Inf. Hiph., see Robertson Smith in the *Journ. of Philol.* xvi. p. 72 sq.

§ 49. *e* and § 74. *i*, but also § 72. *aa*; in 1st plur. only in Neh. 4, 3; in the 3rd sing. Ps. 105, 28. With *ā* in the principal pause וְתוֹרֶה Ruth 2, 14, and in the lesser pause, Gen. 49, 4; before a sibilant (see § 29. *g*) וַיִּשָּׁל Jud. 6, 19; in the lesser pause וַיִּפֶּה Lam. 3, 5. Before *Maqqeph* the *Šere* becomes *Sghol*, e.g. וַיַּחֲסֹבֵהוּ Jud. 19, 4. In the plural, on the other hand, and before suffixes, *f* remains in the forms יִקְטִילוּ, יִתְקַטְלוּ, also in the jussive and after 1 consecutive, e.g. וַיִּדְבְּקוּ Jud. 18, 22. The only exceptions, where the *f* appears weakened, in the Aramaic manner, to *Šwā*, are וַיִּדְבְּקוּ Jer. 9, 2; וַיִּדְבְּקוּ 1 Sam. 14, 22. 31, 2. 1 Chron. 10, 2; וַיִּדְבְּקוּ Jer. 11, 15; וַיִּדְבְּקוּ Neh. 13, 13, if it is *Hiph'il* of אָצַר, but probably וַיִּדְבְּקוּ is to be read, as in 7, 2; perhaps also וַיִּתְקַטְלוּ Job 19, 3 (according to others, *imperfect Qal*). The same weakening occurs also in the imperfect in 3rd and 2nd masc. sing. before suffixes, 1 Sam. 17, 25. 1 Ki. 20, 33. Ps. 65, 10, and in Job 9, 20, unless the form be *Prēl* = וַיִּשְׁעֵנִי, since the *Hiph'il* is not found elsewhere. It is hardly likely that in these isolated examples we have a trace of the ground-form, *yaqtill*. More probably they are due partly to a misunderstanding of the defective writing, which is found, by a purely orthographical licence, in numerous other cases (even in 3rd sing. יִשְׁלַח Is. 44, 28), and partly are intended, as *formae mixtae*, to combine the forms of *Qal* and *Hiph'il*. Instead of the firmly closed syllable, the Masora requires in Gen. 1, 11 וַיִּשְׁאָל, with *Metheg*.

5. In the *participle*, מֹאֲצִי Ps. 135, 7 appears to be traceable to the ground-form, *maqtill*; yet the *Šere* may also possibly be explained by the retraction of the tone. The Masora appears to require the weakening of the vowel into *Šwā* (see above, letter *n*) in מְחַלְכִּים Zach. 3, 7 (probably, however, מְחַלְכִּים should be read), also in מְחַלְמִים Jer. 29, 8, מְעוֹרְרִים 2 Chron. 28, 23 (but as מ precedes, and accordingly dittography may well have taken place, the participle *Qal* is probably to be read in both places; the reading of the text is perhaps again intended to combine *Qal* and *Hiph'il*, see above, letter *n*), and in the *Qrē* מְחַצְצִירִים 1 Chron. 15, 24 &c. (where the *Kethib* מְחַצְצִירִים is better). The fem. is ordinarily pointed as מְחַצְצֶרֶת Num. 5, 15, מְשַׁנֶּת Lev. 14, 21; in pause מְשַׁנֶּלַח Prov. 19, 14.

6. In the *perfect* there occur occasionally such forms as הִכְלִיטוּ 1 Sam. 25, 7; comp. Gen. 41, 28. 2 Ki. 17, 11. Jer. 29, 1. Mi. 6, 3. Job 16, 7; with the original *ā* in the first syllable וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי Nah. 3, 5.—In הִיאֲלִיחֵנִי I have stained, Is. 63, 3, *ā* stands at the beginning instead of ה, cf. above, letter *k*, on אֲשַׁבֵּים. On the other hand, וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי Is. 19, 6 (see above, letter *g*) is to be regarded, with Olshausen and others, simply as a scribal error for וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי.

¹ Most probably, however, הִיאֲלִיחֵנִי (*perfect Prēl*) is to be read, and the *ā* is only an indication of the change of the *perfect* into the *imperfect*, as also previously, by the punctuation, וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי and וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי (instead of וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי and וְהִיאֲלִיחֵנִי) are made future instead of past. Jewish exegesis applied these Edom-oracles to the Roman (i.e. Christian) empire. So G. Moore in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 292.

see § 69. *r*; on *הִתְחַלֵּץ* &c., § 73. *f*. In point of fact it would be very strange, especially in the case of *הִתְחַלֵּץ* and *הִתְחַלֵּץ*, that of these frequently used verbs, amongst all the forms of Hiph'al and Hoph'al, only the *imperfect* Hoph'al should have been preserved.

§ 54. Hithpa'el.

1. The *Hithpa'el* is connected with *Pi'el*, being formed by prefixing *a* to the *Pi'el*-stem (*gaṭṭēl, gaṭṭal*) the syllable הִתְ (Western Aramaic הִתְ, but in Biblical Aramaic הִתְ; Syr. *et*¹). Like the preformative נ (הִנֵּן) of *Niph'al*, הִתְ has also a reflexive force.

2. The ה of the prefix in this conjugation, as also in *Hothpa'al* *b* (see letter *h*), *Hithpō'el*, *Hithpa'lēl* and *Hithpalpel* (§ 55), under certain circumstances, suffers the following changes:

(a) When the stem begins with one of the harder sibilants ט, צ, or ש, the ה and the sibilant change places (comp. on this *Metathesis*, § 19. *n*), and at the same time the ה after a צ becomes the emphatic ט: thus *הִתְשַׁמֵּר* to take heed to oneself, for *הִתְשַׁמֵּר*; *הִתְסַבֵּל* to become burdensome, for *הִתְסַבֵּל*; *הִתְצַדֵּק* to justify oneself, from *צָדַק*. The only exception is in Jer. 49, 3, with ש, to avoid the cacophony which would result from the succession of three *t*-sounds.

(b) When the stem begins with a *d*- or *t*-sound (ד, ט, ת), the ה of *c* the preformative is assimilated to it (§ 19. *d*), e.g. *מְדַבֵּר* speaking, conversing; *הִדְבַּח* to be crushed, *הִדְהַר* to purify oneself, *הִדְפֵּא* to defile oneself, *הִתְהַלַּח* to act uprightly. (An exception occurs in Jud. 19, 22.) The assimilation of the ה occurs also with נ and כ, e.g. *הִנְבֵּא* to prophesy, as well as *הִתְנַבֵּא* (comp. Num. 24, 7. Ezek. 5, 13. Dan. 11, 14); *הִתְנַבֵּן* Num. 21, 27 (comp. Is. 54, 14. Ps. 59, 5); *הִתְנַפֵּחַ* Prov. 26, 26; with ש Eccles. 7, 16; with ר Is. 33, 10.

Rem. Metathesis would likewise be expected, as in the cases under letter *a*, *d* when ה and ת come together, as well as a change of ה to ד. Instead of this, in the only instance of the kind (*הִתְדַבֵּר* Is. 1, 16) the ה is assimilated to the ד, —unless indeed *הִתְדַבֵּר*, imperative *Niph'al* of *דַּבַּר*, is intended.

3. As in form, so also in meaning, *Hithpa'el* is primarily (a) reflexive *e* of *Pi'el*, e.g. *הִתְאַזַּר* to gird oneself, *הִתְקַדַּשׁ* to sanctify oneself. Although in these examples the intensive meaning is not distinctly marked, it is so in other cases, e.g. *הִתְנַקַּם* to show oneself revengeful (*Niph.* simply to take revenge), and in the numerous instances where the

¹ So also in Hebrew *הִתְחַלֵּץ* 2 Chron. 20, 35; comp. Ps. 76, 6.

Hithpa'el expresses *to make oneself* that which is predicated by the stem, *to conduct oneself* as such, *to show oneself*, *to imagine oneself*, *to affect* to be of a certain character. E.g. הִתְגַּדַּל *to make oneself great, to act proudly*; הִתְחַכֵּם *to show oneself wise, crafty*; הִתְחַלֵּף *to pretend to be ill*; הִתְעַשֵּׂר *to make i.e. to feign oneself rich*; הִשְׁתַּחֲרַךְ Num. 16, 13, *to make oneself a prince*; הִתְנַבֵּא 1 Sam. 18, 10, *to act in an excited manner like a prophet, to rave*. The meaning of *Hithpa'el* sometimes coincides with that of *Qal*, both forms being in use together, e.g. אָבַל *to mourn*, in *Qal* only in poetic style, in *Hithpa'el* in prose. On the accusative after *Hithpa'el* (regarded as a transitive verb), see § 117. w.

f (b) It expresses reciprocal action, like *Niph'al*, § 51. d, e.g. הִתְרַחֵם *to look upon one another*, Gen. 42, 1; comp. Ps. 41, 8;—but (c) it more often indicates an action less directly affecting the subject, and describes it as performed *with regard to* or *for* oneself, in one's own especial interest (comp. *Niph'al*, § 51. e). *Hithpa'el* in such cases readily takes an accusative, e.g. הִתְפָּרַק Ex. 32, 3, *to tear off from oneself*; הִתְפַּשֵּׁט *exuit sibi (vestem)*, הִתְפַּחַח *solvit sibi (vincula)*; הִצְטִיךְ Jos. 9, 12, *to take (something) as one's provision*; without an accusative, הִתְהַלֵּךְ *to walk about for oneself (ambulare)*; הִתְפַּלֵּל *sibi intercedere* (see Delitzsch on Is. 1, 15); הִתְחַקֵּה *to draw a line for oneself*, Job 13, 27; on Is. 14, 2, see § 57 note.

g (d) Only seldom is it passive, e.g. הִשְׁתַּכַּח *to be forgotten*, Eccles. 8, 10, where the reflexive sense (*to bring oneself into oblivion*) has altogether disappeared. Comp. *Niph'al*, § 51. f.

h The passive form *Hothpa'al* is found only in the few following examples: הִפְתָּא *to be defiled*, Deut. 24, 4; infinitive הִכְבֵּם *to be washed*, Lev. 13, 55. 56; הִרְשִׁנָה (for הִרְשִׁנָה, the נָה being treated as if it were the affirmative of the fem. plur.) *it is made fat*, Is. 34, 6. On הִתְפַּקֵּד, see letter l.

i Denominatives with a reflexive meaning are הִתְיַחַד *to embrace Judaism*, from יָחַד (יְהוּדָה) *Judah*; הִצְטִיךְ *to provision oneself for a journey*, from צִידָה *provision for a journey* (see § 72. m).

k Rem. 1. As in *Pi'el*, so in *Hithpa'el*, the perfect very frequently (in stems ending in ג, ק, ט, פ) has retained the original *Pathah* in the final syllable (while in the ordinary form it is attenuated, as in *Pi'el*, to *i* and then lengthened to *e*), e.g. הִתְנַחֵף Deut. 4, 21 and elsewhere, comp. 2 Chron. 13, 7. 15, 8; with consecutive Is. 8, 21; so also in the imperfect and imperative, e.g. הִתְחַכֵּם Eccles. 7, 16; comp. Deut. 9, 8. 18. 1 Sam. 3, 10. 2 Sam. 10, 12. 1 Ki. 11, 9. Is. 55, 2. 58, 14. 64, 11. Ps. 55, 2; הִתְחַחֵק 1 Ki. 20, 22. Ps. 37, 4. Esth. 5, 10.—In Lev. 11, 44.

20, 7 and Ezek. 38, 23 *t* for *d* occurs before ש (comp. § 44. *d*), and in the last passage before ל. In the *perfect*, *imperfect* (with the exception of Eccles. 7, 16), and *imperative* of *Hithpa'el* (as well as of *Hithp'el*, *Hithpa'el*, *Hithpa'el*, § 55) the original *d* always returns in *pause* as *Qames*, e.g. התאמר Ps. 93, 1; יתאמר Ezek. 7, 27; יתאמר Job 18, 8; יתאמר 38, 30; יתאמר Jos. 3, 5; comp. Job 33, 5 and § 74. *b*. The *d* also appears before the fuller ending ך in the plural of the imperfect (comp. § 47. *m*) as in Ps. 12, 9. Job 9, 6. 16, 10.—Like the *Pf'el* תתפלל (§ 52. *n*), forms occur in *Hithpa'el* like תתפלל Zech. 6, 7; comp. Am. 8, 13, and so in *Hithp'el*, Jer. 49, 3. Am. 9, 13; with *š* only in Lam. 4, 1.—In the Aramaic manner an *infinitive* *Hithpa'el* התפאר occurs in Dan. 11, 23 (cf. the *Hiph'il* inf. התפאר in Ezek. 24, 26).

2. As instances of the *reflexive* התפיל (connected with *Pf'el*) a few reflexive forms of the verb פקד (to *examine*) are also probably to be reckoned. Instead of a *Pathah* in a sharpened syllable after the first radical, these take *Qames* in an open syllable, e.g. התפקד Judges 20, 15. 17, *imperfect* יתפקד 20, 15. 21, 9. The corresponding passive form התפקד also occurs four times, Num. 1, 47. 2, 33. 26, 62. 1 Ki. 20, 27. According to others, these forms are rather reflexives of *Qal*, in the sense of *to present oneself for mustering, to be mustered*, like the Aramaic *'Ithpe'el* (Western Aramaic מתקמל, Syr. מתקמל) and the Ethiopic *taqa'mla*, Arab. *'igtatala*, the last with the *t* always placed after the first radical (comp. above, letter *b*); but they are more correctly explained, with König, as *Hithpa'el* forms, the doubling of the *p* being abnormally omitted.—Such a reflexive of *Qal*, also with the ת transposed, occurs in the inscription of the Moabite king *Mā'a'*, with the meaning of the Old Test. *Niph'al* נלחם *to fight, to wage war*: see the Inscription, lines 11, 15, 19, and 32; in the first two places in the *imperfect* with *wāw* consecutive ואלתחם; in line 19 in the *infinitive* with suffix, בהלתחמה כי *in his fighting against me*.

§ 55. Less Common Conjugations.

Of the less common conjugations (§ 39. *g*) some may be classed *a* with *Pi'el*, others with *Hiph'il*. To the former belong those which arise from the lengthening of the vowel or the repetition of one or even two radicals, in fact, from an internal modification or development of the stem; to the latter belong those which are formed by prefixing a consonant, like the ה of *Hiph'il*. Amongst the conjugations analogous to *Pi'el* are included the *passive* forms distinguished by their vowels, as well as the reflexives with the prefix ה, on the analogy of *Hithpa'el*.

The following conjugations are related to *Pi'el*, as regards their *b* inflexion and partly in their meaning:

1. *Pf'el* קיטל, passive *Pfal* קיטל, reflexive *Hithp'el* התקוטל, corresponding to the Arabic conj. III. *qā'idā*, pass. *qā'idā*, and conj. VI. reflexive *uqā'idā*;

imperfect יִקְוֹטֵל, *participle* מְקוֹטֵל, *imperfect passive* יִקְוֹטֵל &c. Hence it appears that in Hebrew the *θ* of the first syllable is in all the forms obscured from *ā*, while the passive form is distinguished simply by the *a*-sound in the second syllable. In the strong verb these conjugations are rather rare. Examples: *participle* מִשְׁפָּטִי *mine adversary, who would contend with me*, Job 9, 15; מְלֹוֹשְׁנִי (denominative from לָשׁוֹן *the tongue*) *slandering* (as if *intent on injuring with the tongue*) Ps. 101, 5 *Kth*. The *Q^{re}* requires, without apparent reason, מִלְּשֹׁנִי (*m^llōšni*); וְזָרְמוּ *they have poured out*, Ps. 77, 18 (if not rather *Pu'al*); וְיִדְעֵתִי *I have appointed*, 1 Sam. 21, 3 (unless וְהִדְעֵתִי should be read); וְיָעַרְךָ Hos. 13, 3; וְשָׁרַשׁ *to take root*, passive שָׁרֵשׁ, *denominative* from שָׁרַשׁ *root* (on the other hand, שָׁרַשׁ *is to root out*); from a verb לִיָּהּ שִׁשְׁתִּי Is. 10, 13; *Hithpa'al* Jer. 25, 16. 46, 8; Is. 52, 5 (*participle* מְנַאֵץ for מְתַנַּחֵץ).

- c *Po'el* proper (as distinguished from the corresponding conjugations of verbs ע'ע' § 67. l and ע'ע' § 72. m, which take the place of the ordinary causative *Pi'el*) expresses an aim or endeavour to perform the action, especially with hostile intent, and is hence called, by Ewald, the stem expressing the *aim* (Ziel-stamm), *endeavour* (Suche-stamm) or *attack* (Angriffs-stamm); comp. the examples given above from Job 9, 15. Ps. 101, 5, and עוֹיֵן 1 Sam. 18, 9 *Q^{re}* (probably for מְעוֹיֵן, comp. § 52. s; § 55. f: *seeking to cast an evil eye*).

With קוֹטֵל is connected the formation of quadriliterals by the insertion of a consonant between the first and second radicals (§ 30. 3, § 56).

- d 2. *Pi'el*, generally with the *ā* attenuated to *i* = *Pi'lal* (*Pi'ial*), קָטַל and קָטַלְל; the *ē* in the final syllable also arises from *i*, and this again from *ā*; passive *Pu'al* קָטַלְלָהּ, reflexive *Hithpa'al* הִתְקַטַּלְלָהּ, like the Arabic conjugations IX. 'iqṭāllā and XI. 'iqṭāllā, the former used of permanent, the latter of accidental or changing conditions, e.g. of colours; comp. שָׁאֲנָן *to be at rest*, רָעֵנָן *to be green*, passive נִתְקַטַּל *to be withered*, all of them found only in the *perfect* and with no corresponding *Qal* form. (For the barbarous form צִמְתְּתֵנִי Ps. 88, 17 read צִמְתְּתֵנִי; for נִפְלַל Ezek. 28, 23, which has manifestly arisen only from confusion with the following חָלַל, read נִפְלַל). These forms are more common in verbs ע'ע', where they take the place of *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'al* (§ 72. m). Comp. also § 75. kk.

- e 3. *P^aalal*: קָטַלְטַל with repetition of the last two radicals, used of movements repeated in quick succession; e.g. סָחַרְחַר *to go about quickly, to palpitate* (of the heart) Ps. 38, 11, from סָחַר *to go about*; passive הִסְרַחֵר *to be in a ferment, to be heated, to be red*, Job 16, 16. Lam. 1, 20. 2, 11. Probably this is also the explanation of הִצְצַרְצַר (denom. from הִצְצַרְצַר *a trumpet*, but only in the *participle*, 1 Chron. 15, 24 &c. *Kth*.) for הִצְצַרְצַר, by absorption of the first ר, lengthening of *ā* in the open syllable, and subsequent obscuring of *ā* to *θ*. On the other hand, for the meaningless הָבֵהּ הָבֵהּ Hos. 4, 18 (which could only be referred to this conjugation if it stood for הָבֵהּ הָבֵהּ) read הָבֵהּ הָבֵהּ, and for the equally meaningless יִפְסִיִּתִי Ps. 45, 3 read יִפְסִיִּתִי. In both these cases a scribal error (*ditlography*) has been perpetuated by the punctuation which did not venture to alter the *Kth*. On the employment of *P^aalal* in the formation of nouns, comp. § 84b, viii. Closely related to this form is—

4. *Pilpel* (pass. *Pilpal*), with a doubling of the two essential radicals in stems *פִּלְפֵּל*, *פִּלְפָּל*, and *פִּלְפִּי*, e.g. *פִּלְפֵּל* to roll, from *פָּל* = *פָּלַל*; *פִּלְפָּל* from *פָּלַל*, passive *פִּלְפָּל*; reflexive *פִּלְפָּל* to roll oneself down; comp. also *פִּלְפָּל* (so Baer after Qimhi; others *פִּלְפָּל*) Is. 14, 23, and with *ד* in both syllables owing to the influence of *ר*, *פִּלְפָּד* from *פָּדַר* Num. 24, 17 (comp. however, in the parallel passage, Jer. 48, 45 *פִּלְפָּד*) and Is. 22, 5, in the *participle*. Probably to this form also belongs *פִּלְפָּע*, the emended reading of Job 39, 30, instead of the impossible *פִּלְפָּע*; also the *participle* *פִּלְפָּע* Hos. 7, 5 for *פִּלְפָּע* (comp. § 52. 5), and *פִּלְפָּא* Is. 27, 8, if that form is to be referred to an *infinitive* *פִּלְפָּא*; perhaps also *פִּלְפָּא* Ezek. 39, 2 for *פִּלְפָּא*. This form also commonly expresses rapidly repeated movement, which all languages incline to indicate by a repetition of the sound¹, e.g. *פִּלְפָּע* to chirp; comp. in the *Lexicon* the nouns derived from *פָּרַר*, *פָּרַר*, *פָּרַר*, and *פָּרַר*.

As *Hithpalpel* we find *פִּלְפָּל* Nah. 2, 5; *פִּלְפָּל* Esth. 4, 4; *פִּלְפָּר* Dan. 8, 7. 11, 11. Of the same form is *פִּלְפָּד* Is. 38, 15, if contracted from *פִּלְפָּד* or *פִּלְפָּד* (from the root *פָּדַר* or *פָּדַר*), and also *פִּלְפָּד* *tarry ye*, Is. 29, 9, *פִּלְפָּד* (in *pause*) Gen. 19, 16 &c., if it is to be derived from *פָּדַר*.

Only examples more or less doubtful can be adduced of—

5. *Tiph'el* (properly *Taph'el*): *פִּתְּפֵּל*, with *ת* prefixed, comp. *פִּתְּפֵּל* to teach to walk, to lead (denominative from *פָּתַל* a foot?) Hos. 11, 3; from a stem *פִּתְּ*, the *imperfect* *פִּתְּפֵּל* to contend with, Jer. 12, 5; *participle*, 22, 15 (from *פָּתַל* to be hot, eager). Similarly in Aramaic, *פִּתְּפֵּל* to interpret, whence also in Hebrew the *passive participle* *פִּתְּפֵּל* Ex. 4, 7.

6. *Saph'el*: *פִּשְׁפָּל*, frequent in Syriac, e.g. *פִּשְׁפָּל* from *פָּלַח* to flame; whence in Hebrew *פִּשְׁפָּל* flame. Perhaps of the same form is *פִּשְׁפָּל* a snail (unless it be from the stem *פִּשְׁ*), and *פִּשְׁפָּל* hollow strakes, comp. § 85, No. 50. This conjugation is perhaps the original of *Hiph'el*, in which case the *ה*, by a phonetic change which may be exemplified elsewhere, is weakened from a sibilant.

* * *

Forms of which only isolated examples occur are:—

7. *קָטַלְתִּי*, *passive קָטַלְתִּי*; as *קָטַלְתִּי* peeled off, like scales, Ex. 16, 4, from *קָטַל*, *קָטַל* to peel, to scale.

8. *קָטַלְתִּי*, in *קָטַלְתִּי* a sudden shower of rain, from *קָטַל*.

¹ Comp. Lat. *tinno*, *tintinnus*, our *tick-tack*, *ding-dong*, and the German *wirrwarr*, *klingklang*. The repetition of the same letter in verbs *פִּלְפָּל* produces the same effect; as in *פִּלְפָּל* to lick, *פִּלְפָּל* to pound, *פִּלְפָּל* to trip along. The same thing is expressed also by *diminutive* forms, as in Latin by the termination *-illo*, e.g. *cantillo*, in German by *-eln*, *-ern*, e.g. *stimmern*, *trillern*, *tröpfeln*, to trickle.

² The existence of a *Taph'el* is contested on good grounds by Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 279.

9. נִחְסַפֵּל (frequent in New Hebrew¹) a form compounded of *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*; as וְנִחְסַפְּרוּ for וְנִתְּנוּפָּרוּ that they may be taught, Ezek. 23, 48; נִכְפַּר probably an error for הִתְכַּפַּר to be forgiven, Deut. 21, 8. On יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה Prov. 27, 15, see § 75. x.

§ 56. Quadriliterals.

On the origin of these altogether secondary formations comp. § 30. p. While the quadrilateral nouns are tolerably numerous, only the following examples of the verb occur:

(a) On the analogy of *Pf'el*: כָּרַסִים, imperfect יִכְרַסְסֶנָּה he doth ravage it, Ps. 80, 14 from כָּרַס, comp. נָחַם. Passive הִתְפַּשׁ to grow fresh again, Job 33, 25. Participle מְכַרְבֵּל girt, clothed (comp. Aramaic כָּבַל to bind) 1 Chron. 15, 27. It is usual also to include among the quadriliterals פָּרֵשׁ Job 26, 9, as a *perfect* with *Pathah* not attenuated, in the Aramaic manner. It is more correctly, however, regarded, with Delitzsch, as the *infinitive absolute* of a *Pf'el* formation, from פָּרַשׁ to spread out, with euphonic change of the first שׁ to פֿ, and the second to י. Moreover, the reading פָּרֵשׁ also is very well attested, and is adopted by Baer in the text of Job; comp. the Rem. on p. 48 of his edition.

(b) On the analogy of *Hiph'il*: הִשְׁמָאִיל, by syncope הִשְׁמָאִיל and הִשְׁמָאִיל to turn to the left (denom. from שָׁמַל) Gen. 13, 9. Is. 30, 21, and elsewhere. On הִאֲנִיחוּ comp. § 53. p.

C. STRONG VERB WITH PRONOMINAL SUFFIXES².

§ 57.

The accusative of the personal pronoun, depending on an active verb³, may be expressed (1) by a separate word, אֹת the accusative sign (before a suffix אָתָּה, אַתָּה) with the pronominal suffix, e.g. קָטַל אֹתוֹ he has killed him; or (2) by a mere suffix, קָטַלְתָּהוּ or קָטַלְתָּו he has killed him. The latter is the usual method (§ 33), and we are here con-

¹ [See Strack and Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der Neuhebräischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1884, § 91. S. R. D.]

² This subject of the verbal suffixes is treated here in connexion with the strong verb, in order that both the forms of the suffixes and the general laws which regulate their union with verbal forms may be clearly seen. The rules which relate to the union of the suffixes with weak verbs will be given under the several classes of those verbs.

³ An accusative suffix occurs with *Niph'al* in Ps. 109, 3 (since נִלְחָם is used in the sense of to attack), and according to some, in Is. 44, 21; with *Hithpa'el* Is. 14, 2 (הִתְנַחֵל to appropriate somebody to oneself as a possession); comp. above, § 54. f, and § 117. w.

cerned with it alone¹. Neither of these methods, however, is employed when the accusative of the pronoun is *reflexive*. In that case a reflexive verb is used, viz. Niph'al or Hithpa'el (§§ 51 and 54), e.g. *הִתְקַדֵּשׁ* *he sanctified himself*, not *קִדְּשׁ*, which could only mean *he sanctified him*².

Two points must be specially considered here: the form of the suffix itself (§ 58), and the form which the verb takes when suffixes are added to it (§§ 59–61).

§ 58. *The Pronominal Suffixes of the Verb.*

Cf. the statistics collected by H. Petri, *Das Verbum mit Suffixen im Hebr.*, part ii, in the *נבואות ונביאים*, Leipzig, 1890.

1. The *pronominal suffixes* appended to the verb express the *a* accusative of the *personal pronoun*. They are the following:—

A.	B.	C.
<i>To a form ending in a Vowel.</i>	<i>To a form in the Perf. ending in a Consonant.</i>	<i>To a form in the Imperf. ending in a Consonant.</i>
Sing. 1. com. <i>נִי</i>	<i>נִי</i> (in pause <i>נִי־</i>)	<i>נִי</i> <i>me.</i>
2. m. <i>ךָ</i>	<i>ךָ</i> (in pause <i>ךָ־</i> , also <i>ךָ־</i>)	<i>ךָ</i> <i>thee.</i>
f. <i>ךָ</i>	<i>ךָ־</i> <i>ךָ־</i> , rarely <i>ךָ־</i>	<i>ךָ־</i>
3. m. <i>וֹ</i> , <i>י</i>	<i>וֹ</i> , <i>י</i> (<i>וֹ</i>)	<i>וֹ</i> <i>him.</i>
f. <i>הָ</i>	<i>הָ־</i>	<i>הָ־</i> <i>her.</i>
Plur. 1. com. <i>נוֹ</i>	<i>נוֹ־</i>	<i>נוֹ־</i> <i>us (nos).</i>
2. m. <i>כֶּם</i>	<i>כֶּם־</i>	<i>כֶּם־</i> <i>you (vos).</i>
f. ³		
3. m. <i>הֶם</i> , <i>ם</i>	<i>הֶם־</i> (from <i>הֶם־</i>), <i>ם־</i>	<i>הֶם־</i> (from <i>הֶם־</i>) <i>eos.</i>
poet. <i>מֶם</i>	<i>מֶם־</i>	<i>מֶם־</i>
f. <i>ןֶם</i>	<i>ןֶם־</i> , <i>ןֶם־</i> ³ <i>eas.</i>

¹ On the cases where *הֶם* is necessary, see § 117. *c.*

² Jer. 7, 19. Ezek. 34, 2. 8. 10 are only apparent exceptions. In all these instances the sharp antithesis between *הֶם־* (*themselves*) and another object could only be expressed by retaining the same verb; also in Ex. 5, 19 *הֶם־* after an active verb serves to emphasize the idea of *themselves*.

³ *הֶם־* occurs only once as a *verbal* suffix (Deut. 32, 26, unless, with Kahan, *Infinitive u. Participien*, p. 13, *הֶם־* from *הֶם־* is to be read), while the forms *ןֶם* (2nd *f. pl.*) and *ןֶם־* and *ןֶם־* (3rd *f. pl.*), added by Qimhi, never occur.

b 2. That these suffixes are connected with the corresponding forms of the personal pronoun (§ 32) is for the most part self-evident, and only a few of them require elucidation.

c The suffixes וְ, וּ, וֹ and וֹ (also וֹ, when a long vowel in an open syllable precedes) never have the tone, which always rests on the preceding syllable; on the other hand, מֶ and מֶ always take the tone.

d In the 3rd pers. masc. from וֹ, by contraction of *a* and *u* after the rejection of the weak ו, there frequently arises *š* (§ 23. *k*), ordinarily written *š*, much less frequently ו (see § 7. *c*). In the *feminine*, the suffix וֹ should be pronounced with a preceding *a* (comp. below, letter *f*, note), as וֹ or וֹ, on the analogy of *āhd*; instead of וֹ, however, it was simply pronounced וֹ, with the rejection of the final vowel, and with *Mappiq*, since the ו is consonantal; but the weakening to וֹ is also found, see below, letter *g*.

e 3. The *variety* of the suffix-forms is occasioned chiefly by the fact that they are modified differently according to the form and tense of the verb to which they are attached. For almost every suffix three forms may be distinguished:

(*a*) One beginning with a consonant, as וְ, וֹ, וֹ (only after *š*), וּ, (מֶ) מֶ, &c. These are attached to verbal forms which end with a vowel, e.g. וְ; וֹ; וֹ, for which by absorption of the ו we also get וֹ, pronounced *q'āltu*; cf. § 8. *m*.

f (*β*) A second and third with what are called *connecting vowels*¹ (וְ, וֹ), used with verbal forms ending with a consonant (for exceptions, see § 59. *g* and § 60. *e*). This *connecting vowel* is *a* with the forms of the perfect, e.g. וְ, וֹ, וֹ; and *e* (less frequently *a*) with the forms of the imperfect and imperative, e.g. וֹ, וֹ; also with the infinitive and participles, when these do not take noun-suffixes (comp. § 61. *a* and *h*). The form וֹ also belongs to the suffixes of the perfect, since it has arisen from וֹ (comp., however, § 60. *d*). With וֹ, מֶ, the connecting sound is only a vocal *š'wd*,

¹ We have kept the term *connecting vowel*, although it is rather a superficial description. Most probably these *connecting syllables* are really the remains of old verbal terminations, like the *t* in the 2nd pers. fem. sing. וֹ. Observe e.g. the Hebrew form *q'āl-ani* in connexion with the Arabic *qatala-ni*, contrasted with Hebrew *q'ālat-ni* and Arabic *qatalat-ni*. König accordingly prefers the expression 'vocalic ending of the stem,' instead of 'connecting syllable.'

which has arisen from an original short vowel, thus קָטַף , דָּבַר , e.g. קָטַף ($q^*tā'khā$), or when the final consonant of the verb is a guttural, קָטַף , e.g. קָטַף . In *pause*, the original short vowel (\bar{a}) reappears as *Sghöl* with the tone קָטַף (comp., however, קָטַף Deut. 28, 24 and frequently; even without the *pause* קָטַף Jer. 23, 37). On the appending of suffixes to the final ף of the imperfect (§ 47. *m*), see § 60. *e*.

Rem. 1. As *rare* forms may be mentioned *sing.* 2nd pers. *masc.* קָטַף Gen. 8 27, 7. 1 Ki. 18, 44, &c., in *pause* also קָטַף (see below, letter *z*); *fem.* קָטַף , קָטַף Ps. 103, 4. 137, 6. Instead of the form קָטַף , which is usual even in the perfect (e.g. Jud. 4, 20. Ezek. 27, 26), קָטַף occurs as *fem.* Is. 60, 9 (as *masc.* Deut. 28, 45. Is. 30, 19. 55, 5 always in *pause*); with *Munah* Is. 54, 6.—In the 3rd *masc.* קָטַף Ex. 32, 25. Num. 23, 8; in the 3rd *fem.* קָטַף without *Mapptq* (comp. § 91. *e*) Ex. 2, 3. Jer. 44, 19; Am. 1, 11, with retraction of the tone before a following tone-syllable).—The forms קָטַף , קָטַף , קָטַף are wholly poetic¹ (with the exception of Ex. 23, 31); instead of קָטַף there occurs in Ex. 15, 5 קָטַף . On the origin of these forms, see § 32. *m*; on the use of קָטַף as a singular, see the 2nd note on § 103. *f*; on קָטַף and קָטַף as suffixes of the 3rd fem. plur. of the imperfect, § 60. *d*.—In Gen. 48, 9 קָטַף (cf. קָטַף 1 Chron. 14, 11 according to Baer), קָטַף has lost the tone before *Maqqeph* and so is shortened to קָטַף .—In Ezek. 44, 8 קָטַף is probably an error for קָטַף .

2. From a comparison of these verbal suffixes with the noun-suffixes (§ 91) we find that (*a*) there is a greater variety of forms amongst the verbal than amongst the noun-suffixes, the forms and relations of the verb itself being more various;—(*b*) the verbal suffix, where it differs from that of the noun, is longer; comp. e.g. קָטַף , קָטַף , קָטַף (*me*) with קָטַף (*my*). The reason is that the pronominal object is less closely connected with the verb than the possessive pronoun (the genitive) is with the noun; consequently the former can also be expressed by a separate word (קָטַף &c.).

4. A verbal form with a suffix gains additional strength, and sometimes intentional emphasis, when, instead of the mere connecting vowel, a full connecting-syllable² ($\bar{a}n$) is inserted between the suffix and the verbal stem. Since, however, this syllable always has the tone, the \bar{a} is invariably (except in the 1st pers. sing.) lengthened

¹ In Ps. 2 קָטַף occurs five times, and קָטַף only twice.

² It is, however, a question whether, instead of a connecting syllable, we should not assume a special verbal form, analogous to the Arabic *energetic mood* (see the Rem. at the end) and probably also appearing in the Hebrew cohortative (see the foot-note on § 48. *c*). According to Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebr. Gramm. im Talmud u. Midrasch*, the form with *Nān* is used to express the simple future and to lay stress upon the object, while the ordinary form is used to express the optative or after *wāw consecutive*, a remark which is almost always confirmed by the facts.

to *S'ghól*. This is called the *Nûn energeticum*¹ (less suitably *demonstrativum* or *epentheticum*), and occurs principally (see, however, Deut. 32, 10) in pausal forms of the imperfect, e.g. יְבַרְכֶנּוּ he will bless him (Ps. 72, 15, comp. Jer. 5, 22), יִכְבֶּדֵנִי he will honour me (Ps. 50, 23); rarely in the perfect, Deut. 24, 13. On examples like נָתַן Gen. 30, 6, comp. § 26. g. In far the greatest number of cases, however, this *Nûn* is assimilated to the following consonant (ג, כ), or the latter is lost in pronunciation (so ה), and the *Nûn* consequently sharpened. Hence we get the following series of suffix-forms:—

1st pers. אֲנִי (even in pause, Job 7, 14 and elsewhere), אֲנִי (for אֲנִי, אֲנִי).

2nd pers. אַתָּה (Jer. 22, 24 in pause אַתָּה) and, only orthographically different,

אַתָּה (Is. 10, 24. Prov. 2, 11 in pause).

3rd pers. הוּא (for הוּא),² fem. הִיא for הִיא.

[1st pers. plur. אֲנִי (for אֲנִי)], see the Rem.

In the other persons *Nûn* energetic does not occur.

Rem. The uncontracted forms with *Nûn* are rare, and occur only in poetic or elevated style (Ex. 15, 2. Deut. 32, 10. Jer. 5, 22. 22, 24); they are never found in the 3rd fem. sing. and 1st plur. On the other hand, the contracted forms are tolerably frequent, even in prose. An example of אֲנִי as 1st plur. occurs perhaps in Job 31, 15 (but hardly in Hos. 12, 5); comp. הִנֵּנוּ behold us, Gen. 44, 16. 50, 18. Num. 14, 40 for הִנֵּנוּ.—In Ezek. 4, 12 the Masora requires הִנֵּנוּ, without Dageš in the *Nûn*.

That the forms with *Nûn energeticum* are intended to give greater emphasis to the verbal form is seen from their special frequency in pause. Apart from the verb, however, *Nûn energeticum* occurs also in the union of suffixes with certain particles (§ 100. o).

This *Nûn* is frequent in Western Aramaic. In Arabic the corresponding forms are the two *energetic moods* (see § 48. d) ending in *an* and *anna*, which are used in connexion with suffixes (e.g. *yaqtulan-ka* or *yaqtulanna-ka*) as well as without them.

§ 59. The Perfect with Pronominal Suffixes.

1. The endings (*affirmatives*) of the perfect occasionally vary somewhat from the ordinary form, when connected with pronominal suffixes; viz.:—

¹ So König, *Lehrgeb.* i. p. 226.

² On הוּא = הוּא. Num. 23, 13, see § 67. o.

(a) In the 3rd *sing. fem.* the original feminine ending נִּי or נִי is used for נִי .

(b) 2nd *sing. masc.* besides אַתָּה we find אַתָּ , to which the connecting vowel is closely attached, but the only clear instances of this are with נִי .

(c) 2nd *sing. fem.* אַתְּ , the original form of אַתָּ ; comp. אַתְּ , אַתְּ , § 32. f; § 44. g. This form can be distinguished from the 1st pers. only by the context.

(d) 2nd *plur. masc.* אַתֶּם for אַתְּם , a change which is explained by the Arabic '*antum, qataltum*', Aram. אַתְּם , אַתְּם for Heb. אַתֶּם , אַתֶּם (§ 32. i). The only examples are Num. 20, 5. 21, 5. Zech. 7, 5. The *fem.* אַתְּנָה never occurs with suffixes; probably it was not distinguished in pronunciation from the masculine.

We exhibit first the forms of the perfect *Hiph'il*, as they are pronounced when connected with suffixes, since here no further changes take place in the stem itself, except as regards the tone (see No. 2).

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
3. m. הִקְטִיל	3. c. הִקְטִילוּ
3. f. הִקְטִילָהּ	
2. m. הִקְטִילְתָּ , הִקְטִילְתָּ	2. m. הִקְטִילְתֶּם
2. f. הִקְטִילְתְּ , הִקְטִילְתְּ	
1. c. הִקְטִילְתִּי	1. c. הִקְטִילְתֶּם

The beginner should first practise connecting the suffixes with these *Hiph'il* forms and then go on to unite them to the *Perfect Qal* (see letter d).

2. The addition of the suffix generally causes the tone to be thrown forward towards the end of the word, since it would otherwise fall, in some cases, on the ante-penultima; with the *heavy* suffixes (see letter e) the tone is even transferred to the suffix itself. Considerations of tone, especially in the Perfect *Qal*, occasion certain vowel changes: (a) the *Qames* of the first syllable, no longer standing before the tone, always becomes vocal *Šwā*; (b) the original *Pathah* of the second syllable, which in the 3rd *sing. fem.* and 3rd *plur.* had become *Šwā*, now reappears, and, in an open syllable before the tone, is even

¹ Even here it is extremely probable that the *d* belongs originally to the verbal form, see § 58. f, note.

² According to Nöldeke, *ZDMG.* 38, p. 415, the ground-form of the 2nd *plur. masc.* probably terminated in *tumā*.

lengthened to *Qameṣ*; similarly original *i* (as in the 3rd *sing. masc. without* a suffix) reappears, and is lengthened to *ē*, e.g. **יִשְׁכַּבְּ**

1 Sam. 18, 22. Prov. 19, 7.

d The forms of the perfect of Qal consequently appear as follows:—

Singular.	Plural.
3. <i>m.</i> קָטַל	3. <i>c.</i> קָטְלוּ
3. <i>f.</i> קָטְלָה (קָטַלְתָּ , letter <i>g</i>)	
2. <i>m.</i> קָטַלְתָּ (קָטַלְתָּ , letter <i>h</i>)	2. <i>m.</i> קָטַלְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i> קָטַלְתְּ (קָטַלְתְּ , letter <i>h</i>)	
1. <i>c.</i> קָטַלְתִּי	1. <i>c.</i> קָטַלְתִּם

The connexion of these forms with all the suffixes is shown in *Paradigm C*. It will be seen there also, how the *Sere* in the Perfect *Piʿel* changes sometimes into *Sʿghol*, and sometimes into vocal *Sʿwd*.

e Rem. 1. The suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. **כֶּם** and **הֶם**, since they end in a consonant and also always have the tone, are distinguished as *heavy* suffixes (*suffixa gravia*) from the rest, which are called *light* suffixes. Compare the connexion of these (and of the corresponding feminine forms **נָן** and **הָן**) with the *noun*, § 91. With a perfect **כֶּם** alone occurs, Ps. 118, 26. The form **קָטַלְכֶם** which is usually given as the connective form of the 3rd sing. masc. before **כֶּם** and **נָן** is only formed by analogy, and is without example in the Old Testament.

f 2. In the 3rd *sing. masc.* **קָטַלְהוּ** (especially in verbs **לִי**; in the strong verb only in Jer. 20, 15 in *Piʿel*) is mostly contracted to **קָטְלוּ**, according to § 23. *k*; likewise in the 2nd sing. masc. **קָטַלְתֶּהוּ** to **קָטַלְתֶּם**.—As a suffix of the 1st sing. **יָנִי** occurs several times with the 3rd sing. masc. perf. Qal of verbs **לִי**, not only in *pause* (as **עָנִי** Ps. 118, 5; **קָנִי** Prov. 8, 22 with *Dʿhe*), but also with a conjunctive accent, as **הָרָנִי** Job 30, 19; **עָנִי** 1 Sam. 28, 15 (where, however, the reading **עָנִי** is also found).

g 3. The 3rd *sing. fem.* **קָטַלְתָּ** (= **קָטַלְתְּ**) has the twofold peculiarity that (*a*) the ending *alh* always takes the tone¹, and consequently is joined to those suffixes, which form a syllable of themselves (**נִי**, **יָ**, **הָ**, **נָ**), without a connecting vowel, contrary to the general rule, § 58. *f*; (*b*) before the other suffixes the connecting vowel is indeed employed, but the tone is drawn back to the *penultima*, so that they are pronounced with shortened vowels, viz. **הָנִי**, **יָנִי**, e.g. **אֶהְבֶּתְךָ** *she loves thee*, Ruth 4, 15; **שָׁרְפָתָם** *she has stolen them*, Gen. 31, 32; **תִּבְרָכְתֶּם** *it burns them*, Is. 47, 14. Jos. 2, 6. Hos. 2, 14. Ps. 48, 7. For **הָנִי**, **יָנִי**

¹ **הָבִילְתְּךָ** Cant. 8, 5 is an exception. **כֶּם** would probably even here have the tone (letter *e*); but no example of the kind occurs in the Old Testament. In Is. 51, 2 the *imperfect* is used instead of the *perfect* with a suffix.

&c., in *pause* תָּנִי is found, Jer. 8, 21. Ps. 69, 10, and תָּנִי Cant. 8, 5; and also without the *pause* for the sake of the assonance תָּנִי, *she was in travail with thee*, in the same verse (Cant. 8, 5). The form קָטַלְתָּ (e.g. Ruth 4, 15) has arisen, through the loss of the ך and the consequent sharpening of the ך (as in נָּ and נָּ for נָּ and נָּ, comp. § 58. i), from the form קָטַלְתָּ, which is also found even in *pause* אֶהְבֶּתְהוּ 1 Sam. 18, 28; elsewhere it takes in *pause* the form קָטַלְתָּ Is. 59, 16; so קָטַלְתָּ from קָטַלְתָּ; comp. 1 Sam. 1, 6. Is. 34, 17. Jer. 49, 24. Ruth 3, 6; in *pause* Ezek. 14, 15, always, on the authority of Qimhi, without *Mappiq* in the ך, which is consequently always a mere vowel-letter.

4. In the 2nd *sing. masc.* the form קָטַלְתָּ is mostly used, and the suffixes have, *h* therefore, no connecting vowel, e.g. פָּרַצְתָּנּוּ וְנָחַתָּנּוּ *thou hast cast us off, thou hast broken us down*, Ps. 60, 3; but with the suff. of the 1st *sing.* the form קָטַלְתָּנִי is used, e.g. חָקַרְתָּנִי Ps. 139, 1; in *pause*, however, with *Qames*, e.g. עָוַבְתָּנִי Ps. 22, 2; Jud. 1, 15 (with *Zaqeph qaton*); comp., however, also יָצַרְתָּנִי Ps. 17, 3 with *Mer'kha*.—In the 2nd *sing. fem.* תָּנִי is also written defectively, רָפִיִּיתְהִי 1 Sam. 19, 17. Jud. 11, 35. Jer. 15, 10. Cant. 4, 9. Occasionally the suffix is appended to the shorter form (תָּנִי), viz. הִשְׁבַּעְתָּנִי *thou (fem.) dost adjure us*, Cant. 5, 9. Jos. 2, 17, 20; comp. Jer. 2, 27, and, quite abnormally, with *Sere* הוֹרִידְתָּנִי *thou (fem.) didst let us down*, Jos. 2, 18, where הוֹרִידְתָּ would be expected. In Is. 8, 11 יִפְרֹתִי is probably intended as an *imperfect*.

5. In verbs *middle e*, the *e* remains even before suffixes (see above, letter *e*), *i* e.g. אֶהְבֶּתְהוּ Deut. 15, 16, אֶהְבֶּתְהוּ 1 Sam. 18, 28, comp. 18, 22; יִרְאֶהוּ Job 37, 24. From a verb *middle o* there occurs יִכְלֹתִי *I have prevailed against him*, Ps. 13, 5, from יָלַל with *o* instead of *e* in a syllable which has lost the tone (§ 44. e).

§ 60. *Imperfect with Pronominal Suffixes.*

In those forms of the *imperfect* Qal, which have no affirmatives, the *a* vowel *o* of the second syllable mostly becomes * (simple vocal *S'wad*), sometimes * (—); thus in the principal *pause*, Num. 35, 20. Is. 27, 3. 62, 2. Jer. 31, 33. Ezek. 35, 6. Hos. 10, 10; before the principal *pause*, Ps. 119, 33; before a secondary *pause*, Ezek. 17, 33; even before a conjunctive accent, Jos. 23, 5. Before ך, ך, however, it is shortened to *o* (*Qames-hatuph*), e.g. יִשְׁמְדְךָ (but in *pause* יִשְׁמְדְךָ or יִשְׁמְדְךָ; with *Nûn energicum*, see § 58. 4), &c. Instead of תִּקְטַלְנָה, the form תִּקְטַלְנָה¹ is used for the 2nd and 3rd *fem. plur.* before suffixes; Jer. 2, 19. Job 19, 15. Cant. 1, 6.

¹ This form is also found as *feminine* without a suffix, Jer. 49, 11. Ezek. 37, 7. In the latter passage וְתִקְטַלְנָה is probably to be regarded, with König, as a clumsy correction of the original וְיִקְטַלְנָה, intended to suggest the reading וְתִקְטַלְנָה, to agree with the usual gender of עֲצֻמוֹת.

- b* Rem. 1. יִתְּבַרְךָ Ps. 94, 20 is an anomalous form for יִתְּבַרְךָ (comp. the analogous יִתְּנֶנְךָ § 67. *n*) and יִתְּנֶנְךָ (so Baer; others יִתְּנֶנְךָ) Gen. 32, 18 for יִתְּנֶנְךָ . To the same category as יִתְּבַרְךָ belong also, according to the usual explanation, תַּעֲבֹדֶם (from תַּעֲבֹד , Ex. 20, 5. 23, 24. Deut. 5, 9, and נָעַב Deut. 13, 3. As a matter of fact, the explanation of these forms as imperfects of *Qal* appears to be required by the last of these passages; yet why has the retraction of the *o* taken place only in these examples (beside numerous forms like יִעֲבֹדֶנִּי)? Could the Masora in the two Decalogues and in Ex. 23, 24, (on the analogy of which Deut. 13, 3 was then wrongly pointed,) have intended an imperfect *Hoph'al* with the suffix = *thou shalt not allow thyself to be brought to worship them*?
- c* Verbs which have a *a* in the second syllable of the imperfect, and imperative, *Qal* (to which class especially *verba tertiae* and *mediae guttur.* belong, § 64 and § 65) do *not*, as a rule, change the *Pathah* of the imperfect (nor of the imperative, see § 61. *g*) into vocal *S'wā* before suffixes; but the *Pathah*, coming to stand in an open syllable before the tone, is rather lengthened to *Qamez*, e.g. יִלְבְּשֵׁנִי Job 29, 14; יִנְאָלְהוּ 3, 5; יִשְׁלַחֵם Jos. 8, 3; יִקְרְאוּ Ps. 145, 18; but also יִקְרְאוּ Jer. 23, 6.
- d* 2. As exceptions, though they are not rare, suffixes with the connecting vowel *a* are found with the imperfect, e.g. תִּרְבֹּכֶנִּי Gen. 19, 19, comp. 29, 32. Ex. 33, 20. Num. 22, 33. 1 Ki. 2, 24 *Q'el*, Is. 56, 3. Job 9, 18; also נִי , Gen. 27, 19. Job 7, 14. 9, 34. 13, 21 (in principal *pause*); יִקְרֶיךָ Gen. 37, 33, comp. 16, 7. 2 Sam. 11, 27. Is. 26, 5. Job 28, 27. 1 Chron. 20, 2; יִקְרֶנִּי Is. 63, 16 (manifestly owing to the influence of the preceding יִרְעֶנִּי); יִלְבֹּשֶׁם Ex. 29, 30, comp. 2, 17. Num. 21, 30. Deut. 7, 15. Ps. 74, 8; even אֶמְלִיכֶם 118, 10-12; יִלְבְּשֶׁנִּי Ex. 2, 17, and יִדְחֶנִּי Hab. 2, 17 (where, however, the old versions read יִדְחֶנִּי ; even יִדְחֶנִּי (δ from *dhw*) Hos. 8, 3; comp. Ex. 22, 29, Jos. 2, 4. 1 Sam. 18, 1 *K'el*, 21, 14 (where, however, the text is corrupt); 2 Sam. 14, 6 (where it would be better to read יִדְחֶנִּי , or with the old versions יִדְחֶנִּי); Jer. 23, 6 (see § 74. *e*). Ps. 35, 8. Eccles. 4, 12.—On pausal *S'ghōl* for *Sere* in וְאֶבְרַכְכֶּם Gen. 48, 9 and וְאֶלְעָזָר (so Baer, but not ed. Mant.) Jud. 16, 6, see § 29. *g*.
- e* 3. Suffixes are sometimes also appended to the plural forms in *n*, e.g. תִּפְּרָאֲנִי will ye break me in pieces? Job 19, 2; יִשְׁרְתֶּנְךָ (here necessarily with a connecting vowel) Is. 60, 7. 10; Prov. 5, 22 (*i*); elsewhere always without a connecting vowel; יִקְרְאֲנִי with two other examples Prov. 1, 28. Hos. 5, 15; comp. נִי Ps. 63, 4. 91, 12; נִי Jer. 5, 22; נִי Jer. 2, 24 — all in principal *pause*.
- f* 4. In *P'el*, *Pō'el*, and *Po'el*, the *Sere* of the final syllable, like the *o* in *Qal*, becomes vocal *S'wā*; but before the suffixes ךָ and כֶּם it is shortened to *S'ghōl*, e.g. יִסְבֹּנְךָ Deut. 30, 4. Ps. 34, 12. Is. 51, 2. With a final guttural, however, *ē* is retained in the tone-syllable יִשְׁכַּחֲךָ Gen. 32, 27; also Prov. 4, 8, where with *Qimhi* יִכְבֹּדְךָ is to be read; an analogous case in *Hiph'il* is יִגְדֹּלְךָ Deut. 32, 7. Less frequently *Sere* is sharpened into *Hireq*, e.g. יִחַדְכֶם Job 16, 5, comp. Ex. 31, 13. Is. 1, 15. 52, 12; so in *Po'el*, Is. 25, 1. Ps. 30, 2. 37, 34. 145, 1, and probably also in *Qal* אֶסְפֶּךָ 1 Sam. 15, 6; comp. § 68. *h*.
- g* 5. In *Hiph'il* the long *t* remains, e.g. תִּלְבִּשֵׁנִי Job 10, 11 (after *wāw* con-

secutive often written defectively, e.g. וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם Gen. 3, 21 and *passim*). Forms like תַּעֲשִׁירָהּ *thou enrichest it*, Ps. 65, 10. 1 Sam. 17, 25, are rare. Comp. § 53. n.

6. Instead of the suffix of the 3rd plur. fem. (י), the suffix of the 3rd plur. masc. (ו) is affixed to the affirmative י, to avoid a confusion with the personal ending י; comp. וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם Gen. 26, 15 (previously also with a perf. וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם); Gen. 26, 18. 33, 13. Ex. 2, 17 (where וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם occurs immediately after); 39, 18. 20. 1 Sam. 6, 10 (where also וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם is for וַיִּלְכְּשֵׁם, a neglect of gender which can only be explained by § 135. o).

§ 61. *Infinitive, Imperative and Participle with Pronominal Suffixes.*

1. The *infinitive construct* of an *active verb* may be construed with *a* an accusative, and therefore can take a *verbal suffix*, i. e. the *accusative* of the personal pronoun. The only undoubted instances of the kind, however, in the Old Testament are infinitives with the verbal suffix of the 1st pers. sing., e.g. לִדְרֹשִׁי *to inquire of me*, Jer. 37, 7. As a rule the infinitive (as a *noun*) takes *noun-suffixes* (in the *genitive*), e.g. עָבְרִי *my passing by*; מְלִכּוֹ *his reigning*, see § 115. a and c. The infinitive *Qal*, then, usually has the form *qāl*, the short vowel returning to the first radical (on the probable ground-form *qūl*, see § 46. a). The result is, as a rule, a half-closed syllable, e.g. בְּכַתְּבוֹ *in his writing*, Jer. 45, 1, not כְּתַבּוֹ *kəth-bō*, see § 21. f; comp., however, הִפְסִי Gen. 19, 21; נָגַפּוֹ (so ed. Mant.; others נָגַפּוֹ) Ex. 12, 27; עָצְבִי 1 Chron. 4, 10; before הִי and כֵּם also the syllable is completely closed, e.g. בְּאִסְפָּךְ Ex. 23, 16. Lev. 23, 39 (but in pause לְהִרְגֶּךָ Gen. 27, 42), unless the vowel be retained in the second syllable; see letter d. With the form קָטַל generally, compare the closely allied nouns of the form לָטַל (before a suffix קָטַל or קָטַל), § 84 a, 1; § 93. g.

Rem. 1. The infin. of verbs which have *ō* in the last syllable of the *imperfect* of *Qal*, sometimes takes the form *qūl*, before suffixes, e.g. בְּכַנְּנוֹ Ex. 21, 8; מְכַרְם Am. 2, 6 (but מְכַרְהָ Ex. 21, 8), נָפְלוֹ 2 Sam. 1, 10 (but נָפְלוֹ 1 Sam. 29, 3), שָׁבְרִי Lev. 26, 26. Ezek. 30, 18 &c. According to Barth (see above, § 47. i with the note) these forms with *i* in the first syllable point to former *i*-imperfects.

Infinitives of the form קָטַל (§ 45. c) in verbs middle or third guttural (but cf. also שָׁכַבָּה Gen. 19, 33. 35—elsewhere שָׁכַבְתָּ and שָׁכַבְתָּ) before suffixes sometimes take the form *qāt*, as וָעָפּוֹ Jon. 1, 15 (and, with the syllable only half closed, פָּעֻטוֹ Jud. 13, 25), מְחַחֵךְ and רָסַעַךְ Ezek. 25, 6; sometimes *qūl*, with the *a* attenuated to *i*, especially verbs third guttural; as בְּמַחֲחֵךְ, פִּלְעִי, בְּקַעֲסִי, בְּנָעִי, בְּרַעֲסִי.—Contrary to § 58. f (1 Chron. 12, 17) and נָעֻ (Ex. 14, 11) are found with the *infinitive* instead of נָעֻ and נָעֻ. On נָעֻ *my following*

Ps. 38, 21, for which the *Q^{re}* requires קָרַח, comp. the analogous examples in § 46. *e*.

- d* 2. With the suffixes קָנִי and כָּנִי, contrary to the analogy of the corresponding nouns, forms occur like אָכַלְתָּ *thy eating*, Gen. 2, 17; אָכַלְתָּ Gen. 3, 5; עָמַדְתָּ (others עָמַדְתָּ)¹ Obad. 11, i. e. with *ō* shortened in the same way as in the *imperfect*, see § 60. But the analogy of the nouns is followed in such forms as קָצַרְתָּ *your harvesting*, Lev. 19, 9. 23, 22 (with a return of the original *ā*), and מִדְּסַחְתָּ (read *mōdōsakhēm*) *your despising*, Is. 30, 12; comp. Deut. 20, 2; on בָּמִצְאָתָּ Gen. 32, 20 (for בָּמִצְאָתָּ), see § 74. *h*.

- e* Examples of the *infinitive Niph'al* with suffixes are, הִשְׁמַדְתָּ Ex. 14, 18; הִשְׁמַדְתָּ Deut. 28, 20 (in *pause*, הִשְׁמַדְתָּ verse 24); הִשְׁמַדְתָּ Ps. 37, 33; הִזְכַּרְתָּ Ezek. 21, 29; הִשְׁמַדְתָּ Deut. 7, 23. In the *infinitive* of *P^{re}l* (as also in the *imperfect*, see § 60. *f*) the *ē* before the suff. הִ, becomes *S^ghōl*, e. g. הִבְרַחְתָּ Ex. 4, 10, and with a sharpening to הִבְרַחְתָּ Is. 1, 15 (see § 60. *f*). In the *infinitive P^{re}l*, הִבְרַחְתָּ occurs (with *a* for *ē* or *ī*) Am. 5, 11, but probably הִבְרַחְתָּ, with Wellhausen, is the right reading; the correction *D* has crept into the text alongside of the *corrigendum* *W*.

- f* 2. The leading form of the *imperative Qal* before suffixes (קָטַלְתָּ) is due probably (see § 46. *d*) to the return of the original short vowel of the first syllable (ground-form *qūlūl*). In the *imperative* also *ō* stands in a half-closed syllable, e. g. כֹּחַבְתָּ *kōh'bhēm* (not *kōlh-bēm*), &c.¹ As in the *imperfect* (§ 60. *d*) and *infinitive* (see above, letter *c*), so also in the *imperative*, suffixes are found united to the stem by an *a*-sound; e. g. בָּהַרְתָּ Is. 30, 8; comp. 2 Sam. 12, 28. — The forms קָטַלְתָּ, קָטַלְתָּ, which are not exhibited in Paradigm C, undergo no change. Instead of קָטַלְתָּ, the masc. form קָטַלְתָּ is used, as in the *imperfect*.

- g* In verbs which form the *imperative* with *a*, like שְׁלַח (to which class belong especially verbs *middle* and *third guttural*, §§ 64 and 65), this *a* retains its place when pronominal suffixes are added, but, since it then stands in an open syllable, is, as a matter of course, lengthened to *Qameṣ* (just as in *imperfects Qal* in *a*, § 60. *c*), e. g. שְׁלַח־נִי *send me*, Is. 6, 8, בְּהַנִּי Ps. 26, 2, קְרָא־נִי Ps. 50, 15, שְׁמַע־נִי Gen. 23, 8. In Am. 9, 1, בְּצַע־נִי (so Baer, instead of the ordinary reading בְּצַע־נִי) for בְּצַע־נִי is irregular. The retraction of the tone, which causes the

¹ שְׁמַרְתָּ *šām'rēnt* required by the Masora in Ps. 16, 1 (also שְׁמַרְתָּ Ps. 86, 2. 119, 167; comp. Is. 38, 14 and עָמַדְתָּ Obad. 11), belongs to the disputed cases discussed in § 9. *v* and § 48. *i*, note. According to Delitzsch, the short *ā*, which is the value of the *Qameṣ haṭuṭṭā* of the Masora (see above, § 8. *d*), is here simply lengthened to long *ā*.

change of *ē* to *ā*, is doubtless to be explained, with König, as a case of *nasog 'ahor* (comp. 29. *e*, and the analogous קָהֶם-נָא *bring them, I pray thee*, Gen. 48, 9).—In the imperative *Hiph'il*, the form used in conjunction with suffixes is not the 2nd *sing. masc.* הַקְטִיל, but הַקְטִיל (with *l* on account of the open syllable, comp. § 60. *g*), e. g. הַקְטִילָהּ *present it*, Mal. 1, 8.

3. Like the infinitives, the participles can also be united with either *h* verbal or noun-suffixes; see § 116. 3. In both cases the vowel of the participles is shortened or becomes *Ṣwd* before the suffix, as in the corresponding noun-forms, e. g. from the form קָטַל; קָטֵל, &c.; but before *Ṣwd mobile* קָטַל, &c., or with sharpening קָטַלְךָ Ex. 23, 4 and elsewhere, אָסַפְךָ 2 Kings 22, 20 (coinciding in form with the 1st *sing. imperfect Qal*, 1 Sam. 15, 6; comp. § 68. *h*). On the other hand, with a middle guttural (נָאֵל, נָאֵלְךָ; with a third guttural, בָּרָאֵךְ Is. 43, 1, but שָׁלַחְךָ, comp. § 65. *d*). The form מִסְפֵּל, with suffix מִסְפֵּלִי; before *Ṣwd* sometimes like מִלְפָּדְךָ Is. 48, 17, מִנְחָמְכֶם 51, 12, sometimes like מִסְפֵּחְכֶם 52, 12. In Is. 47, 10, רָאִי is irregular for רָאִי; instead of the quite meaningless מִסְלָלְתִי Jer. 15, 10, the true reading is קִלְלוֹתִי בְלִהֶם.

§ 62. Verbs with Gutturals.

Verbs which have a guttural for one of the three radicals differ in their inflexion from the ordinary strong verb, according to the general rules in § 22. These differences do not affect the consonantal part of the stem, and it is, therefore, more correct to regard the guttural verbs as a subdivision of the strong verb. At the most, only the complete loss of the doubling in some of the verbs *middle guttural* (as well as in the *imperfect Niph'al* of verbs *first guttural*) can be called a real weakness (§§ 63. *h*, 64. *d*). On the other hand, some original elements have been preserved in guttural stems, which have degenerated in the ordinary strong verb; e. g. the *ā* of the initial syllable in the *imperfect Qal*, as in יִחַמֵּד, whilst elsewhere it is attenuated to *ī*, יִחַמֵּל.—In guttural verbs *א* and *ה* are only taken into consideration when they are actual consonants, and not vowel-letters like the *א* in some verbs אָמַר (§ 68), in a few אָעַר (§ 73. *g*), and in most אָלַח (§ 74). In all these cases, however, the *א* was at least originally a full consonant, while the *ה* in verbs אָלַח was never

anything but a vowel letter, comp. § 75. The really consonantal ה at the end of the word is marked by *Mappah*.—Verbs containing a ה also, according to § 22. 5, share some of the peculiarities of the guttural verbs. For more convenient treatment, the cases will be distinguished, according as the guttural is the first, second or third radical. (Comp. the Paradigms D, E, F, in which only those conjugations are omitted which are wholly regular.)

§ 63. *Verbs First Guttural*, e. g. עמד to stand.

a In this class the deviations from the ordinary strong verb may be referred to the following cases:—

1. Instead of a *simple Šwd mobile*, the initial guttural takes a *compound Šwd* (*Haṭeph*, § 10. f, § 22. l). Thus the *infinitives* עמד, אכל to eat, and the *perfects, and plur. masc.* עמדום, אכלום from עמד to be inclined, correspond to the forms קטל and קטלום, and אכלו to אכלו, and so always with initial א before a suffix for an original ā, according to § 22. o.

b 2. When a preformative is placed before an initial guttural, the two may either form a closed syllable, or the vowel of the preformative is repeated as a *Haṭeph* under the guttural. If the vowel of the preformative was originally a, two methods of formation may again be distinguished, according as this a remains or is attenuated to ĩ.

c Examples: (a) of firmly closed syllables with the original vowel of the preformative (always with ō in the second syllable; but cf. letter e): יחבר, יחבל, יחשב, יחשף, יעבד Jer. 9, 3 (probably to distinguish it from the name יעקב, just as in Jer. 10, 19, &c., the participle fem. Niph'al of חלל is נחלה to distinguish it from נחלה), &c., and so generally in the *imperfect Qal* of stems beginning with ח, although sometimes parallel forms exist, which repeat the ā as a *Haṭeph*, e. g. יחשב &c. The same form appears also in the *imperfect Hiph'il* יחסיר, &c. Very rarely the original ā is retained in a closed syllable under the preformative י of the *perfect Niph'al*: יחבא Gen. 31, 27; comp. 1 Sam. 19, 2. Jos. 2, 16, also the *infinitive absolute* נחום Esth. 8, 8, נחמור 1 Chron. 5, 20, and the *participle fem.* נחלה (see above, letter c), *plur.* נחמור Prov. 27, 6. In these forms the original ā is commonly kept under the preformative followed by *Haṭeph-Pathah*;

thus in the *perfect* of some verbs נָעַשָׂה, e. g. נָעַשָׂה, &c.; in the *infinitive absolute*, נִעְשֶׂה Esth. 9, 1; in the *participle*, נֹעֵץ Ps. 89, 8, &c.

(δ) Of half-closed syllables (where a *Ḥateph* follows) with the *d* original vowel: יִחַבֵּשׁ (but יִחַבֵּשׁ Job 5, 18 in *pause*, יִחַלֵּם, יִעֲמֹד, יִהְיֶה, and so almost always with *y* and *h* in the *imperfects* of *Qal* and *Hiph'il*; in *Hoph'al*, יִעֲמֹד, יִהְיֶה).

The *i* of the preformative, attenuated from *ā*, before a guttural *e* almost always (§ 22. *i*) becomes *S^gghōl* (comp., however, letter *g*). This *S^gghōl* again appears sometimes (*c*) in a closed syllable, e. g. יִחַבֵּשׁ, יִחַסֵּר, יִעֲמֹד, יִהְיֶה, always with *ā* in the second syllable, corresponding to the imperfects of verbs *y'ē*, with original *i* in the first and *ā* in the second syllable, § 67. *p*, and also to the imperfects of verbs *y'ē*, § 72. *h*; but cf. also יִחַסֵּר and יִהְיֶה; in *Niph.*, e. g. נִחְלוּ, נִחְפָּה Am. 6, 6, &c., in *Hiph.* הִחְסִיר, הִחְלִים 2 Kings 4, 27, &c.: sometimes (*d*) in a half-closed syllable (followed by *Ḥateph-S^gghōl*), e. g. יִחַסֵּר, יִחַשֵּׁף in *imperfect Qal*; יִחַסֵּר *Hiph'il*; יִחַשֵּׁף *Niph'al*.

Rem. With regard to the above examples the following points may also *f* be noted: (1) The forms with a firmly closed syllable (called the *hard combination*) frequently occur in the same verb with forms containing a half-closed syllable (the *soft combination*). (2) In the 1st *sing. imperfect Qal* the preformative *ā* invariably receives *S^gghōl*, whether in a firmly or half-closed syllable, e. g. יִחַבֵּשׁ (with the cohortative יִחַבֵּשׁ, יִחַסֵּר, יִעֲמֹד) &c. In Job 32, 17 אֶעֱנֶה must unquestionably be *Hiph'il*, since elsewhere the pointing is always אֶעֱנֶה. Cohortatives like אֶהְרֹג Gen. 27, 41, and אֶחַלֵּם Job 16, 6, are explained by the next remark. (3) The shifting of the tone towards the end frequently causes the *Pathah* of the preformative to change into *S^gghōl*, and *vice versa*, e. g. נָעַשָׂה, but נִעְשֶׂה 3rd *sing. fem.*; יִחַבֵּשׁ, but יִחַבֵּשׁ; יִחַסֵּר, but יִחַסֵּר; יִעֲמֹד, but יִעֲמֹד consecutive יִעֲמֹד &c.; so יִחַסֵּר Gen. 8, 3 the plur. of יִחַסֵּר, comp. Gen. 11, 8; and thus generally a change of the stronger *Ḥateph-S^gghōl* group (ִי־) into the lighter *Ḥateph-Pathah* group (ִי־) takes place whenever the tone is moved one place toward the end (comp. § 27. *w*).

8. When in forms like יִעֲמֹד, נִעְמֹד, the vowel of the final syllable *g* becomes a *vocal Šwā* in consequence of the addition of an affirmative (י, י־, ה, ה־) or suffix, the *compound Šwā* of the guttural is changed into the corresponding short vowel, e. g. יִעֲמֹד, plur. יִעֲמֹדוּ (*ya'-a-mē-dhū* as an equivalent for *ya'-mē-dhū*); נִעְזָבָה, plur. נִעְזָבוּ (*she is forsaken*). But even in these forms the hard combination frequently occurs, e. g. יִחַבְּלוּ they take as a pledge (comp. in the *sing.* יִחַבֵּל, also יִחַבְּלוּ); יִחַזְּקוּ (also יִחַזְּקוּ) they are strong. Comp. letter *m* and, in general, § 22. *m*, § 28. *c*.

- h* 4. In the *infinitive, imperative, and imperfect Niph'al*, where the first radical should regularly be doubled (יָמַסְל, הָקַמְסַל), the doubling is always omitted, and the vowel of the preformative lengthened to *Sere*; יָעֲמֹד for *yi'āmēd*¹, &c. Comp. § 22. 1.—For תַּעֲשֶׂה Ex. 25, 31 (according to Dillmann, to prevent the pronunciation תַּעֲשֶׂה, which the LXX and Samaritan follow) read תַּעֲשֶׂה.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

- i* 1. In verbs מ'ד the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* take *Ḥateph-S'ghōl* in the first syllable (according to § 22. *o*), e.g. מְאֹר *gird thou*, Job 38, 3, אָהַב *love thou*, Hos. 3, 1, אָחַז *seize thou*, Ex. 4, 4 (on אָפַח *bake ye*, Ex. 16, 23, see § 76. *d*); אָכַל *to eat*; infinitive with a prefix אָחַז, אָכַל, אָבַל Is. 5, 24; אָהַב Eccles. 3, 8. Sometimes, however, *Ḥateph-Pathah* is found as well, e.g. *infinitive* אָחַז 1 Ki. 6, 6; אָכַל Num. 26, 10 (before a suffix אָכַלְךָ, אָכַלְכֶם § 61. *d*); comp. Deut. 7, 20, 12, 23. Ezek. 25, 8. Ps. 102, 5. Prov. 25, 7 (אָמַרְךָ). Job 34, 18, always in close connexion with the following word. With a firmly closed syllable after ל comp. לְחַסוֹת Is. 30, 2; לְחַתוֹת 30, 14. Hag. 2, 16; לְחַשֵּׁב Ex. 31, 4, &c.; לְעוֹר 2 Sam. 18, 3 *Q'el*, but also לְעוֹר 1 Chron. 15, 26.
- k* The הִתְחַלֵּיתִי Jud. 9, 9. 11. 13 is altogether anomalous. According to Qimhi, Olshausen, and others, the Masora intended a *perfect Hoph'al* with syncope of the preformative after the ה interrogative = הִתְחַלֵּיתִי, or (according to Olshausen) with the omission of the ה interrogative. But since the *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* of חָלַל nowhere occur, it is difficult to believe that such was the intention of the Masora. We should expect the *perfect Qal*, הִתְחַלֵּיתִי. But since the *Qameṣ* under the ה, falling between the tone and counter-tone, was naturally less emphasized than in הִתְחַלֵּיתִי, without the ה interrogative, it was weakened, not to simple *S'wā*, but to *—*, in order to represent the sound of the *Qameṣ* (likewise pronounced as *o*) at least in a shortened form. The *S'ghōl* of the ה interrogative is explained, in any case, from § 100. *n* (comp. the similar pointing of the article, e.g. in הַחֲדָשִׁים, § 35. *k*).
- l* Also in the other forms of the *imperative* the guttural *not* infrequently influences the vowel, causing a change of *i* (on this cf. § 48. *i*) into *e*, e.g. אָסַפְהָ *gather thou*, Num. 11, 16; עָרְבָה *set in order*, Job 33, 5; חָשַׁפְּי *strip off*, Is. 47, 2 (comp. on this irregular *Dageš* § 46. *d*), especially when the second radical is also a guttural, e.g. אָהַבְּי Am. 5, 15. Ps. 31, 24; comp. Zech. 8, 19; אָחַזְּי Cant. 2, 15; comp. also in verbs לִי'ה עָנִי *sing ye*, Num. 21, 17. Ps. 147, 7 (compared with עָנִי *answer ye*, 1 Sam. 12, 3) and אָלִי Joel 1, 8.—*Pathah* occurs in חָבַלְרֵו *hold him in pledge*, Prov. 20, 16, and probably also in Ps. 9, 14 (חָנְנֵנִי).—As a pausal form for חָרַבְי (comp. the *plur.* Jer. 2, 12) we

¹ אָעֲמֹה Job 19, 7 (so even the Mantua ed.) is altogether abnormal: read אָעֲמֹה, with Baer.

find in Is. 44, 27 חָרַבְתִּי (comp. the *imperf.* יִחָרַב) with a repetition of the *ḥ* in the form of a *Hateph-Qames*. For other examples of this kind, see § 10. *h* and § 46. *e*.

2. The pronunciation (mentioned above, No. 2) of the imperfects in *ḥ* with *Seghol* under the preformative in a firmly closed syllable (e.g. יִחָבֵד, יִחָבֵד) regularly gives way to the soft combination in verbs which are at the same time *ḥ*, e.g. יִחָוֶה &c. (but comp. יִחָוֶה &c. Prov. 6, 27, אֶעֱשֶׂה ed. Mant., Ex. 3, 20). Even in the strong verb יִחָנֵן is found along with יִחָנֵן. Comp. also יִחָנֵן Ezek. 23, 5; יִחָנֵן Gen. 27, 36 (so Ben-Asher; but Ben-Naphtali יִחָנֵן); יִחָלֵם Neh. 9, 22, and so always in the *imperfect Qal* of עָוַר with suffixes, Gen. 49, 25 &c.—יִחָאֵב Prov. 1, 22 (for יִחָאֵב) is to be explained from the endeavour to avoid too great an accumulation of short sounds by the insertion of a long vowel; comp. the analogous instances under letter *p*, and such nouns as בָּאֵר, נָאֵב, § 93. *t*.—On יִחָבֵד Ps. 94, 20 for יִחָבֵד (according to Qimhi, and others, rather *Pu'al*) comp. § 60. *b*.

יִחָמֵם Ps. 58, 5 and יִעָרֵם to deal subtilly, 1 Sam. 23, 22. Prov. 15, 5. 19, 25, may be explained with Barth (*ZDMG*. 1889, p. 179) as *i*-imperfects (see above, § 47. *i*),—the latter for the purpose of distinction from the causative יִעָרִים Ps. 83, 4.—Instead of the unintelligible form יִחָלֵם (so ed. Mant.; Baer as in 24, 3) 1 Chron. 23, 6 and יִחָ 24, 3 the *Qal* יִחָלֵם is to be read. The form יִרְדֵּף Ps. 7, 6, which is, according to Qimhi (in *Mikhlol*; but in his Lexicon he explains it as *Hithpa'el*), a composite form of *Qal* (יִרְדֵּף) and *Pu'el* (יִרְדֵּף), can only be understood as a development of יִרְדֵּף (comp. § 64. *h* on יִצְחָק, and § 69. *x* on תִּהְלֹךְ Ex. 9, 23. Ps. 73, 9). Pathah has taken the place of *Hateph-Pathah*, but as a mere helping-vowel (as in שִׁמְעָה § 28. *e*, note 4) and without preventing the closing of the syllable.

II. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

3. The above-mentioned (No. 2, Rem. 3) change of *wa'w* to *ayin* occurs in the *perfect Hiph'il*, especially when the *wa'w* consecutive precedes, and the tone is in consequence thrown forwards upon the affirmative, e.g. הִעֲמִידָהּ, but הִעֲמִידָהּ Num. 3, 6. 8, 13. 27, 19; הִעֲבִירָהּ, but הִעֲבִירָהּ Jer. 15, 14. Ezek. 20, 37; even in the 3rd sing. הִעֲמִיץ Ps. 77, 2.—On the contrary *ayin* occurs instead of *wa'w* in the *imperative Hiph'il*, Jer. 49, 8. 30; and in the *infinitive* Jer. 31, 32. The preformative of עָוַר in *Hiph'il* always takes *a* in a closed syllable: Ex. 8, 4 הִעֲתִירָהּ; verse 5 אֶעֱתִיר; also verse 25 and Job 22, 27.

4. In the *perfect Hiph'il* *ayin* is sometimes changed into *ayin*, and in *Hoph'al* into *ayin* (comp. § 23. *h*), the short vowel supported by *Metheg* being lengthened; הִעֲבִירָהּ Jos. 7, 7, הִעֲבִירָהּ Hab. 1, 15, הִעֲבִירָהּ Jud. 6, 28. 2 Chron. 20, 34. Nah. 2, 8. On a further case of this kind (אֶעֱמִיד) see § 64. *c*. Something similar occurs in the formation of *segholate* nouns of the form *qalal*; comp. § 93. *q*, and (on אֶמְצֵן &c. אֶמְצֵן) § 84. *a*, III. 12. On the *Hoph'al* תִּעְבְּרֶם Ex. 20, 5, and elsewhere, see § 60. *b*.

III. הָיָה and חָיָה.

5. In the verbs הָיָה to be, and חָיָה to live, the guttural hardly ever affects the addition of preformatives; thus *imperfect Qal* יִהְיֶה and יִחְיֶה, *Niph'al* נִהְיֶה;

but in the *perfect Hiph'il* הִחַיֶּה (2nd plur. הִחַיֶּתֶם Jos. 2, 13, and even without *wāw* consecutive, Jud. 8, 19). Initial ה always has *Ḥateph-S'ghôl* instead of vocal *S'wâ*; הִיָּה, הִיוּת, הִיוֹתָם 1 Sam. 25, 7, הִיָּיתָם (except הִיָּי be thou! fem. Gen. 24, 60). The 2nd sing. fem. imperative of הִיָּה is חַיִּי live thou, Ezek. 16, 6; the infinitive, with suffix, חַיִּיתָם Jos. 5, 8. After the prefixes ה, כִּי, כִּי, לִי, מִי (= מִן) both ה and כִּי retain the simple *S'wâ* (§ 28. b) and the prefix takes *î*, as elsewhere before strong consonants with *S'wâ*; hence in the *perfect Qal* חַיִּיתָ, imperative חַיִּי, infinitive לְחַיֵּית, בְּחַיֵּית &c. (comp. § 16. f, e). The only exception is the 2nd sing. masc. of the imperative after *wāw*; וְחַיִּי Gen. 12, 2 and elsewhere, וְחַיִּי Gen. 20, 7.

§ 64. Verbs Middle Guttural, e.g. שָׁחַט to slaughter.

a The slight deviations from the ordinary inflexion are confined chiefly to the following¹—

1. When the guttural would stand at the beginning of a syllable with simple *S'wâ*, it necessarily takes a *Ḥateph*, and almost always *Ḥateph-Pathah*, e.g. *perfect* שָׁחַט, *imperfect* שֹׁחֵט, *imperative Niph'al* הִשָּׁחֵט. In the *imperative Qal*, before the affirmatives *î* and *û*, the original *Pathah* reappears in the first syllable, and is followed by *Ḥateph-Pathah*, since the syllable is only half closed, thus, שִׁחֲטִי, שִׁחֲטִי, &c.; in אֲחֵי the preference of the א for *S'ghôl* (but cf. also אֲחֵי Jer. 13, 21) has caused the change from *ā* to *ê*; in שִׁחֲטִי Job 6, 22, the *î* remains even before a *hard* guttural.

So in the *infinitive Qal fem.*, e.g. אֲחֵי to love, אֲחֵי to pine; and in the *infinitive* with a suffix אֲחֵי Is. 9, 6; to the same form also belongs, according to König, אֲחֵי Hos. 5, 2, which Ewald and others explain as *infinitive Pi'el*.

b 2. As the preference of the gutturals for the *a*-sound has less influence on the following than on the preceding vowel, not only is *Holem* retained after the middle guttural in the *infinitive Qal*, both in the *construct* שָׁחַט (with the fem. ending and retraction of the *o* הִחַיֶּה and הִחַיֶּה, comp. § 45. b) and in the *absolute* שֹׁחֵט, but also, for the most part, the *Sere* in the *imperfect Niph'al* and *Pi'el*, e.g. יָחַם he fights, יָחַם he comforts, and even the more feeble *S'ghôl* after *wāw* consecutive in such forms as וְיָחַם, וְיָחַם Gen. 41, 8 (comp., however, וְיָחַם 1 Kings 12, 6 and elsewhere). But in the *imperative* and *imperfect Qal*, the final syllable, through the influence of the guttural, mostly

¹ *Hoph'al*, which is not exhibited in the paradigm, follows the analogy of *Qal*; *Hiph'il* is regular.

takes *Pathah*, even in transitive verbs, e.g. *יָעַץ*, *יָעַץ*; *יָעַץ*, *יָעַץ*; with *suffixes* (according to § 60. c), *imperative* *יָעַץ*, *imperfect* *יָעַץ*.

With *ō* in the *imperative Qal*, the only instances are *נָעַץ* 2 Sam. 13, 17; *c* *יָעַץ* Ex. 4, 4. 2 Sam. 2, 21, *fem.* *יָעַץ* Ruth 3, 15 (with the unusual repetition of the lost *ō* as *Ḥateph-Qameṣ*; 2nd *plur. masc.* in *pause* *יָעַץ* Neh. 7, 3; without the *pause* *יָעַץ* Cant. 2, 15); *יָעַץ* Jud. 19, 8¹. Finally *יָעַץ* for *יָעַץ*, Num. 23, 7, is an example of the same kind, see § 63. *p*. Just as rare are the imperfects in *ō* of verbs *middle guttural*, as *יָעַץ*, *יָעַץ*, *יָעַץ* Lev. 5, 15, &c. (but *יָעַץ* 2 Chron. 26, 16); cf. *יָעַץ* Ezek. 16, 33; *יָעַץ* Job 35, 6. Also in the *perfect Pi'el*, *Pathah* occurs somewhat more frequently than in the strong verb, e.g. *נָחַם* to comfort (comp., however, *נָחַם*, *נָחַם*, *נָחַם*); but *נ* and *י* always have *ē* in 3rd *sing.*—On the *infinitive* with suffixes, comp. § 61. *b*.

3. In *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hiḥpa'el*, the *Dageš forte* is inadmissible in *d* the middle radical; but in the majority of cases, especially before *ח*, *ת* and *ע*, the preceding vowel, nevertheless, remains short, and the guttural is consequently to be regarded as, at least, *virtually* doubled, comp. § 22. c; e.g. *Pi'el* *נָחַם*, *נָחַם* Jos. 14, 1, *נָחַם* 1 Ki. 14, 10, *נָחַם* Ex. 10, 13 (comp., however, *נָחַם* Gen. 34, 19; *נָחַם* Ex. 15, 13, but in the *imperfect* and *participle* *נָחַם*, &c.; in verbs *ל'וה*, e.g. *נָחַם*, *infinitive* *נָחַם*, *Pu'al* *נָחַם* (but comp. *נָחַם* Ps. 36, 13 from *נָחַם*, also the unusual position of the tone in *נָחַם* Ezek. 21, 18, and in the *perfect Hiḥpa'el* *נָחַם* Job 9, 30); *Hiḥpa'el perfect* and *imperative* *נָחַם*, &c.; in *pause* (see §§ 22. c; 27. q; 29. v; 54. k) *נָחַם* Num. 8, 7. 2 Chron. 30, 18; *נָחַם* Num. 23, 19, &c.

The complete omission of the doubling, and a consequent *e* lengthening of the preceding vowel, occurs invariably only with *ר* (*נָחַם* Ezek. 16, 4 is an exception; *נָחַם* also occurs, Jud. 6, 28), e.g. *נָחַם* (in *pause* *נָחַם*), *imperfect* *נָחַם*, *Pu'al* *נָחַם*. Before *נ* it occurs regularly in the stems *נָחַם*, *נָחַם*, *נָחַם*, and in the *Hiḥpa'el* of *נָחַם*, *נָחַם*, and *נָחַם*; on the other hand, *נ* is *virtually* doubled in the

¹ Also Jud. 19, 5 (where Qimḥi would read *s'ād*), read *s'ād*, and on the use of the conjunctive accent (here *Darga*) as a substitute for Metheg, cf. § 9. *u* (c) and § 16. *b*.

² *נָחַם* is explained by Abulwalīd as the 3rd pers. *perfect Pu'al*, but by Qimḥi as a noun.

perfects, נִצַּח (once in the imperfect, Jer. 29, 23) to commit adultery, נִצַּח to despise (also in the imperfect with *ā*, Ps. 74, 10; in the participle, Num. 14, 23. Is. 60, 14. Jer. 23, 17), נִצַּח to abhor Lam. 2, 7 (also נִצַּח Ps. 89, 40) and נִצַּח Ps. 109, 19; moreover, in the infinitive נִצַּח Eccles. 2, 20, according to the best reading. On the *Mappiq* in the *Pual* נִצַּח Job 33, 21, comp. § 14. d.

f Rem. 1. In the verb נִצַּח to ask, to beg, some forms of the perfect *Qal* appear to be based upon a secondary form middle *e*, comp. נִצַּח Gen. 32, 18. Jud. 4, 20; נִצַּח Ps. 137, 3; נִצַּח I Sam. 12, 13. 25, 5. Job 21, 29; נִצַּח Jud. 13, 6. I Sam. 1, 20 (also *Hiph'il* נִצַּח I Sam. 1, 28). Comp., however, similar cases of attenuation of an original *ā*, § 69. s, and especially § 44. d. In the first three examples, if explained on that analogy, the *ī* attenuated from *ā* would have been lengthened to *ē* (before the tone); in the next three *ī* would have been modified to *ē*.

g 2. In *Pf'il* and *Hithpa'el* the lengthening of the vowel before the guttural not infrequently causes the tone to be thrown back upon the penultima, and consequently the *Sere* of the ultima to be shortened to *S'ghol*. Thus (a) before monosyllables, according to § 29. e, e. g. לִשְׁרֵת שָׁם to minister there, Deut. 17, 12, even in the case of a guttural which is virtually doubled, Gen. 39, 14. Job 8, 18 (see § 29. g). (b) after *wāw* consecutive, e. g. וַיְבָרֶךְ and he blessed, Gen. 1, 22 and frequently, וַיֵּצֵא and he drove out, Ex. 10, 11.

h 3. The following are a few rarer anomalies; in the imperfect *Qal* יָצַח Gen. 21, 6 (elsewhere יָצַח &c., in pause יָצַח, comp. § 10. g (c) and § 63. n); יָצַח Gen. 32, 5 (for יָצַח); in the perfect *Pf'il* יָצַח Jud. 5, 28 (perhaps primarily for יָצַח; according to Gen. 34, 19 יָצַח would be expected), and similarly יָצַח Ps. 51, 7 for יָצַח; in the imperative *Pf'il* יָצַח Ezek. 37, 17 (comp. above, § 52. n); finally, in the imperative *Hiph'il* יָצַח Job 13, 21 and יָצַח Ps. 69, 24, in both cases probably influenced by the closing consonant, and by the preference for *Pathah* in pause (according to § 29. g); without the pause יָצַח Prov. 4, 24, and elsewhere; but also יָצַח Joel 4, 11.

i 4. As infinitive *Hithpa'el* with a suffix we find הִתְיַחֵס Exr. 8, 1, and elsewhere, with a firmly closed syllable, also the participle מְתַיַחֵס Neh. 7, 64; Baer, however, reads in all these cases, on good authority, הִתְיַחֵס &c.—The quite meaningless *K'thibh* וַתַּשְׁאֵר Ezek. 9, 8 (for which the *Q're* requires the equally unintelligible וַתַּשְׁאֵר) evidently combines two different readings, viz. וַתַּשְׁאֵר (part. *Niph.*) and וַתַּשְׁאֵר (imperf. consec.); comp. the exhaustive discussion by König, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 266 sq.—In יַתְאַרְהוּ Is. 44, 13 (also יַתְאַרְהוּ in the same verse) an imperfect *Pf'il* appears to be intended by the Masora (*y'tho'rikkā* with an irregular shortening of the *ō* for יַתְאַרְהוּ; comp. מִלְשֵׁנִי Ps. 101, 5 *Q'rel*); on the other hand Qimhi, with whom Delitzsch agrees, explains the form as *Pf'il*, *y'thā'rikkā* with an irregular *ā* for *ā*, as in the reading אֶלְכָּתָה Ruth 2, 2. 7; comp. § 10. h.

5. A few examples in which *ā*, as a middle guttural, entirely loses its consonantal value and quiesces in a vowel, will be found in § 73. g.

§ 65. Verbs Third Guttural, e.g. *שָׁלַח* to send¹.

1. According to § 22. 2, when the last syllable has a vowel *a* incompatible with the guttural (i.e. *not* an *a*-sound), two possibilities present themselves, viz. either the regular vowel remains, and the guttural then takes *furtive Pathah*, or *Pathah* (in pause *Qames*) takes its place. More particularly it is to be remarked—

(a) The unchangeable vowels *ā*, *ī*, *ū* (§ 25. δ) are always retained, even under such circumstances; hence *infinitive absolute Qal* שָׁלַח, *participle passive* שָׁלֵחַ, *Hiph'il* הִשְׁלִיחַ, *imperfect* יִשְׁלַח, *participle* מְשַׁלֵּחַ. So also the less firm *ō* in the *infinitive construct* שָׁלַח is almost always retained: comp., however, שָׁלַח, in close connexion with a substantive, Is. 58, 9, and שָׁלַח Num. 20, 3. Examples of the *infinitive* with suffixes are שָׁלַח Gen. 35, 1; שָׁלַח Num. 35, 19; שָׁלַח Lev. 18, 23, &c.

(b) The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* almost always have *ā* in the second syllable, sometimes, no doubt, due simply to the influence of the guttural (for a tone-long *ō*, originally *ā*), but sometimes as being the original vowel, thus שָׁלַח, שָׁלַח, &c.; with suffixes שָׁלַח, שָׁלַח, see § 60. c.

Exceptions, in the *imperfect* שָׁלַח Jer. 5, 7, *Keth.* שָׁלַח (*Qeth.*); in the *imperative* שָׁלַח Gen. 43, 16. On such cases as שָׁלַח Is. 27, 4, comp. § 10. h.

(c) Where *Sere* would be the regular vowel of the final syllable, *c* both forms (with *ē*^a and *ā*) are sometimes in use; the choice of one or the other is decided by the special circumstances of the tone, i.e.

Rem. 1. In the *absolute state* of the *participle Qal*, *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el*, the forms שָׁלַח (with suff. שָׁלַח, but שָׁלַח) and מְשַׁלֵּחַ (with suff. מְשַׁלֵּחַ) are used exclusively; on the other hand, the closer connexion in the case of the *construct state participle Qal* causes the sharper pronunciation שָׁלַח, e.g. שָׁלַח Is. 42, 5. Ps. 136, 6, comp. 94, 9. Lev. 11, 7 (no example of a *construct state* is found in the *participle Pi'el*); so also in the *participle Pu'al* מְשַׁלֵּחַ Ezek. 45, 2.

2. Similarly, in the *imperfect* and *infinitive Niph'al*, and in the *perfect, infinitive* and *imperfect Pi'el* the (probably more original) form with *ā* commonly occurs in the body of the sentence, and the fuller form with *ē*^a in *pause* (and even with the lesser distinctives, e.g. with *Dohi* Ps. 86, 4 in the *imperative Pi'el*; with *Tiphha* 1 Ki. 12, 32 in the *infinitive Pi'el*; Jer. 4, 31 *imperfect Hithpa'el*; Jer. 16, 6 *imperfect Niph'al*), comp. e.g. שָׁלַח Num. 27, 4, with שָׁלַח 36, 3, שָׁלַח Deut. 1, 34; even with retraction of the tone in the *infinitive Niph'al* שָׁלַח Num. 30, 3

¹ Verbs *ל'ח* in which the *ח* is *consonantal* obviously belong also to this class, e.g. *נָבַח* to be high, *אִמָּח* to be astonished, *קָדַח* (only in *Hithpalpel*) to delay.

(elsewhere **הִשְׁבִּיעַ** Jer. 7, 9, 12, 16 twice, in each case without the pause); **הִבְשִׁיעַ** Hab. 3, 9, with **הִבְשִׁיעַ** Ezek. 13, 11; **בִּלְעַ** to devour Hab. 1, 13. Num. 4, 20 with **בִּלְעַ** Lam. 2, 8; for *infinitive Hithpa'el*, comp. Is. 28, 20. The *infinitive absolute Pi'el* has the form **שָׁלַח** Deut. 22, 7. 1 Ki. 11, 22; the *infinitive construct*, on the other hand, when without the pause is **שִׁלַּח**, except **לְשַׁלַּח** Ex. 10, 4.—**יָצַח** Hab. 1, 16 has *z*, though not in *pause*, and even **יָצַח** 2 Ki. 16, 4. 2 Chron. 28, 4; but *a* in *pause* in the *imperative Niph'al* **הִצַּח** Ezek. 21, 11; *jussive Pi'el* **הִצַּח** Ps. 40, 18; comp. § 52. *n*. An example of *d* in the *imperative Pi'el* under the influence of a final *l* is **בָּהֲרָה** Job 36, 2, in the *imperfect Niph'al* **וְהִצַּח** Num. 17, 13, &c.—In **יָצַח** Job 14, 9 (cf. Ps. 92, 14. Prov. 14, 11), Barth (see above, § 63. *n*) finds an *i-imperfect of Qal*, since the intransitive meaning is only found in *Qal*.

f 3. In the 2nd *sing. masc.* of the *imperative*, and in the forms of the *jussive* and *imperfect consecutive* of *Hith'l* which end in gutturals, *a* alone occurs, e.g. **הִצַּלְךָ** prosper thou, **יִבְטַח** let him make to trust, **וְיִצְמַח** and he made to grow (so in *Hithpalpel* **וְהִתְמַחֵם**, &c., Hab. 2, 3); even in *pause* **וְיִצְלַח** 1 Chron. 29, 23 (but also with the pausal lengthening of the *d* to *ā* **וְיִצְלַח** 1 Chron. 12, 17); **וְיִשְׁעֶכֶם** Is. 35, 4 is to be emended into **וְיִשְׁעֵי** (= **וְיִשְׁעֵי**).—In the *infinitive absolute Sere* remains, e.g. **הִנְבֵּה** to make high; as *infinitive construct* **הוֹבִיחַ** also occurs in close connexion (Job 6, 26); on **הוֹשִׁיעַ** as *infinitive construct* (1 Sam. 25, 26. 33), comp. § 53. *k*.

g 2. When the guttural with *quiescent S'wd* stands at the end of a syllable, the ordinary strong form remains when not connected with suffixes, e.g. **שָׁלַחְתִּי**, **שָׁלַחְתָּ**. But in the 2nd *sing. fem. perfect* a *helping-Pathah* takes the place of the *S'wd*, **שָׁלַחְתְּ** Jer. 13, 25 (§ 28. *d*); also in 1 Ki. 14, 3, **לְשַׁחֲתָהּ** is to be read according to *Qimhi*, **לְשַׁחְתָּהּ**.

h Rem. The soft combination with *compound S'wd* occurs only in the 1st *plur. perfect* with suffixes, since in these forms the tone is thrown one place farther forward, e.g. **וְיָדַעְנוּךָ** we know thee, Hos. 8, 2 (comp. Gen. 26, 29. Ps. 44, 18. 132, 6). Before the suffixes **ךָ** and **כֶּם**, the guttural must have **־**, e.g. **וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ** I will send thee, 1 Sam. 16, 1; **וְאֶשְׁלַחְכֶּם** Gen. 31, 27; **וְאֶשְׁלַחְכֶּם** Jer. 18, 2.

On the weak verbs **שָׁלַח**, see especially § 74.

II. The Weak Verb¹.

§ 66. *Verbs Primæ Radicalis Nūn* (נ'), e.g. **שָׁבַע** to approach.

a The weakness of initial *l* consists chiefly in its suffering *aphaeresis* in the *infinitive construct* and *imperative* in some of these verbs (comp. § 19. *h*). On the other hand, the assimilation of the *l* (see

¹ Cf. the Table, § 41.

below) cannot properly be regarded as weakness, since the trilateral character of the stem is still preserved by the doubling of the second consonant. The special points to be noticed are—

1. The *aphaeresis* of the Nûn (*a*) in the *infinitive construct*. This ^b occurs only (though not necessarily) in those verbs which have *a* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*. Thus from the stem נגש, *imperfect* נִשֶּׂה, *infinitive* properly נִשֶּׂה, but always lengthened by the feminine termination ת to the segholate form נִשְׂחַת¹; with suffix נִשְׂחַתוּ Gen. 33, 3; with the concurrence of a guttural נִגַּע to touch, *imperfect* נִגַּע, *infinitive* נִגַּעַת (also נִגַּעַת, see below); נִבֵּט to plant, *infinitive* נִבֵּטַת (also נִבֵּטַע, see below); on the verb נָתַן to give, see especially letters *h* and *i*. On the other hand, *aphaeresis* does not take place in verbs which have *ô* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נָפַל to fall, *imperfect* יִפֹּל, *infinitive* נָפַל, with suffix נָפַלוּ, also נָפְלוּ; לָבִיב Num. 6, 2 and elsewhere; comp., moreover, לִנְנֵץ Gen. 20, 6 and elsewhere, וְנִנְעָה Ex. 19, 12 (even לִנְנֵץ Job 6, 7; comp. Jer. 1, 10); with suffix בִּנְנֵעוּ Lev. 15, 23. Also לִנְבֵּט Is. 51, 16 (but לִנְבֵּט Eccles. 3, 2); נָשָׂא Is. 1, 14. 18, 3; with suffix בִּנְשִׂיא Ps. 28, 2 (elsewhere נִשְׂאָה, comp. § 74. *i* and § 76. *ô*), לִנְשִׂא 2 Sam. 20, 9.

(*ô*) In the *imperative*. Here the Nûn is always dropped in verbs with *a* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נִנְשֵׂה, *imperative* נִשֶּׂה (frequently with *paragogic ô*, נִשְׂחַת; before *Maqqeph* also נִשֶּׂה Gen. 19, 9), plur. נִשְׂחַתוּ, &c. Parallel with these there are the curious forms with *ô*, נִשִּׂי Ruth 2, 14 (with *retarding* Metheg in the second syllable, and also *nasog 'ahor*, according to § 29. *e*, before הָלַם) and נִשִּׂי Jos. 3, 9 (before הָלַם), 1 Sam. 14, 38 (before הָלַם) and 2 Chron. 29, 31; in all these cases without the *pause*. The only instance of Nûn being retained, as if in a strong verb, is נִדְרֵה drive, 2 Ki. 4, 24 (*imperfect* יִדְרֶה, without assimilation of the Nûn); comp. also the verbs נִחַח, which are at the same time נִחַח; נִחַח Ezek. 32, 18, נִחַח Ex. 32, 34, נִחַח Ex. 8, 1 and elsewhere; the verb נִשָּׂא Ps. 10, 12 (usually נִשָּׂא). Here also the *aphaeresis* does not take place in verbs which have *ô* in the *imperfect*, e.g. נִצַּר, נִחַץ, &c.

2. When, through the addition of a *preformative*, Nûn stands at *a*

¹ The law allowing the addition of the feminine termination to the unlengthened form, instead of a lengthening of the vowel, is suitably called by Barth 'the Law of Compensation' (*Nominalbildung*, p. xiii).

the end of a syllable, it is readily assimilated to the second radical (§ 19. 2); thus in the *imperfect Qal*¹, e.g. יִפֹּל for *yinpōl*, *he will fall*; יִנָּתֵן for *yingāṣ*; יִנְתֵּן for *yintēn*, *he will give* (on this single example of an *imperfect* with original *i* in the second syllable, cf. letter *h*)²; also in the *perfect Niph'al* נִינָאֵס for *ningāṣ*; throughout *Hiph'il* (נִינָאֵס, &c.) and *Hoph'al* (which in these verbs always has *Qibbuṣ*, in a sharpened syllable, comp. § 9. n) נִינָאֵס.

The other forms are all quite regular, e.g. the *perfect, infinitive absolute* and *participle Qal*, all *Pi'el*, *Pu'al*, &c.

In Paradigm H, only those conjugations are given which differ from the regular form.

- o The characteristic of these verbs in all forms with a preformative is *Dages* following it in the second radical. Such forms, however, are also found in certain verbs יָדָע (§ 71), and even in verbs יָעַץ (§ 67). The *infinitive* יָעֲצֵה and the *imperative* יָעֲצֵה, also יָעֲצֵה (Gen. 19, 9) and יָעֲצֵה, resemble the corresponding forms of verbs יָדָע (§ 69).—On יָעֲצֵה, יָעֲצֵה, and יָעֲצֵה, from יָעֲצֵה to *take*, see letter *g*.—In יָעֲצֵה (*imperfect Niph'al* of יָעֲצֵה), and in similar forms of verbs יָעַץ (§ 72), the full writing of the *o* indicates, as a rule, that they are not to be regarded as *imperfects Qal* of יָעֲצֵה, &c.—Also יָעֲצֵה (Ps. 139, 8) is not to be derived from יָעֲצֵה, but stands for יָעֲצֵה (with a sharpening of the *o* as compensation for the loss of the *l*), from יָעֲצֵה to *ascend*, see § 19. f, and Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 44.

- f Rem. 1. The instances are comparatively few in which the forms retain their *Nún* before a firm consonant, e.g. יָעֲצֵה, imperfect יָעֲצֵה Jer. 3, 5 (elsewhere יָעֲצֵה); also of יָעֲצֵה the pausal form is always יָעֲצֵה (without the *pause* יָעֲצֵה Prov. 20, 28); similarly in Is. 29, 1. 58, 3. Ps. 61, 8. 68, 3 (where, however, יָעֲצֵה is intended), 140, 2. 5. Prov. 2, 11. Job 40, 24, the retention of the *Nún* is always connected with the *pause*. In *Niph'al* this never occurs (except in the irregular *inf.* יָעֲצֵה Ps. 68, 3, cf. § 51. h), in *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* very seldom; e.g. יָעֲצֵה Ezek. 22, 20, הָעֲצֵה Jud. 20, 31; for לָעֲצֵה Num. 5, 22 read לָעֲצֵה, according to § 53. g. On the other hand, the *Nún* is regularly retained in all verbs, of which the second radical is a guttural, e.g. יָעֲצֵה *he will possess*, although there are rare cases like יָעֲצֵה (also יָעֲצֵה) *he will descend*, Jer. 21, 13 (even יָעֲצֵה Prov. 17, 10; without any apparent reason accented as *Mil'el*), plur. יָעֲצֵה Job 21, 13 (comp. § 20. i; the Masora, however, probably regards יָעֲצֵה and יָעֲצֵה as *imperfect Niph'al* from יָעֲצֵה); *Niph'al* נָחַם נָחַם *he has grieved*.

- g 2. The *l* of יָעֲצֵה to *take* is treated like the *Nún* of verbs יָעַץ (§ 19. d). Hence

¹ Cf. Mayer Lambert, 'Le futur qal des verbes יָעַץ, יָעַץ, יָעַץ,' in the *Revue des études Juives*, xxvii. 136 sqq.

² An imperfect in *a* (יָעֲצֵה) is given in the Paradigm, simply because it is the actual form in use in this verb.

imperfect Qal יָצַח, cohortative (§ 20. m) יִצְחָק, *imperative* יִצְחָק, in *pause* and before *suffixes* יִצְחָק (on יִצְחָק־עַד Gen. 48, 9, see § 61. g), *paragogic form* יִצְחָק; יִצְחָק, &c. (but comp. also יִצְחָק Ex. 29, 1. Ezek. 37, 16. Prov. 20, 16, יִצְחָק־י 1 Ki. 17, 11); *infinitive construct* יִצְחָק (once יִצְחָק 2 Ki. 12, 9, comp. § 93. h); with *ל*, יִצְחָק־ל; with *suffix* יִצְחָק־י; *Hoph'al* (comp., however, § 53. u) *imperfect* יִצְחָק; *Niph'al*, however, is always יִצְחָק־נִ.—On יִצְחָק Ezek. 17, 5 and יִצְחָק Hos. 11, 3, see above, § 19. i.

3. The verb יָצַח *to give*, mentioned above, letter *d*, is the only example of a verb י' with *imperfect* in *ē* (יָצַח for *yintēn*; יָצַח only in Jud. 16, 5, elsewhere before *Maqqeph* יָצַח, &c.), and a corresponding *imperative* יָצַח or (very frequently) יָצַח, which the Masora must intend even in Ps. 8, 2, although the text is certainly corrupt; before *Maqqeph* יָצַח, *fem.* יָצַח, &c. Moreover, this very common verb has the peculiarity that its final *Nūn*, as a weak nasal, is also assimilated; יָצַח for *nāthānī*, יָצַח or, very frequently, יָצַח, with a kind of orthographic compensation for the assimilated *Nūn* (comp. § 44. g); *Niph'al perfect* יִצְחָק־נִ Lev. 26, 25. Ex. 9, 7.

In the *infinitive construct Qal* the ground-form *tint* is not lengthened to *tēneth* *i* (as יָצַח from יָצַח), but contracted to *titt*, which is then correctly lengthened to יָצַח, with the omission of *Dageš forte* in the final consonant, see § 20. l; but with *suffixes* יָצַח־י, יָצַח־י, &c.; before *Maqqeph* with the prefix *ל* = יָצַח־ל, e.g. Ex. 5, 21, and even when closely connected by other means, e.g. Gen. 15, 7; however, the strong formation of the *infinitive construct* also occurs in יָצַח Num. 20, 21 and יָצַח Gen. 38, 9; comp. § 69. m, note 2. On the other hand, יָצַח 1 Ki. 6, 19 could not be an *infinitive*: it might conceivably be an *imperfect* with *ל* in a final sense, but probably we ought simply to read יָצַח־ל, just as the *Qrē*, 1 Ki. 17, 14, requires יָצַח for יָצַח.

In other stems, the *י* is retained as the third radical, e.g. יָצַח־י, comp. § 19. c and § 44. n. On the entirely anomalous aphaeresis of the *Nūn* with a strong vowel in יָצַח (for יָצַח) 2 Sam. 22, 41, comp. § 19. i.—On the *passive imperfect* יָצַח, comp. § 53. u.

§ 67. Verbs y'y, e.g. סָבַב *to surround*.

1. A large number of Semitic stems have verbal forms with only *a* two radicals, as well as forms in which the stem has been made trilateral by a *repetition of the second radical*, hence called verbs y'y. Forms with two radicals were formerly explained (in this grammar, as by others) on a general theory of contraction from original forms with three radicals. It is more correct to regard them as representing the original stem (with two radicals), and the forms with the second radical repeated as subsequently augmented from the monosyllabic

stem¹. The appearance of a general contraction of trilateral stems is due to the fact that in biliteral forms the second radical regularly receives *Dageš forte* before affirmatives, except in the cases noted in § 22. *b* and *g*. This points, however, not to an actual doubling, but merely to a strengthening of the consonant, giving more body to the monosyllabic stem, and making it approximate more to the character of trilateral forms.

The augmentation of biliteral to trilateral stems (ע'ע') generally takes place in the 3rd *sing. masc.* and *fem.* and 3rd *plur. perfect Qal* of *transitive verbs*, or at any rate of verbs expressing an activity, e.g. קָבַב, קָבְבָהּ, קָבְבוּ : קָבַבְנִי Gen. 33, 5 (but with suffix חַנְּנִי, ver. 11); sometimes with an evident distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, as צָרַר to *make strait*, צָר to *be in a strait*; see further details, including the exceptions, in letter *aa*. The augmentation of the stem *must* always take place wherever the ordinary strong form has an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable (e.g. קָבַב, קָבְבָהּ), or where the strengthening of the second radical is required by the character of the form, e.g. חָלַל, חָלְלָהּ, &c.

- b* 2. The biliteral stem always (except in *Hiph'al* and the *imperfect Niph'al*, see below) receives the vowel which would have been required in the *second* syllable of the ordinary strong form, or which stood in the ground-form, since that vowel is characteristic of the form (§ 43. *b*), e.g. חָמַד answering to חָמַדְלָהּ, חָמַדְתָּ to the ground-form *qāṭālāt*, חָמַדְתָּ to the ground-form *qāṭālā*; *infinitive*, חָמַדְתָּ to *qāṭālā*.
- c* 3. The insertion of *Dageš forte* (mentioned under letter *a*), for the purpose of strengthening the second radical, never takes place (see § 20. *l*) in the final consonant of a word, e.g. חָמַד, חָמַדְתָּ, not חָמַדְתָּ, חָמַדְתָּ; but it appears again on the addition of affirmatives or suffixes, e.g. חָמַדְתָּ, חָמַדְתָּ, חָמַדְתָּ, &c.
- d* 4. When the affirmative begins with a consonant (ג, ת), and hence the strongly pronounced second radical would properly come at the end of a closed syllable, a *separating vowel* is inserted between the stem-syllable and the affirmative, in the *perfect* י, in the *imperative* and *imperfect* יָ, e.g. חָמַדְתָּ, חָמַדְתָּ, *imperfect* חָמַדְתָּ (for *sabb-la*, *sabb-nu*, *tasobb-na*). The artificial opening of the syllable by means

¹ So (partly following Böttcher) A. Müller, *ZDMG.* xxxiii. p. 698 sqq.; Stade, *Lehrbuch*, § 385. *b*, *c*; Nöldeke, &c.

of a separating vowel is merely intended to make the strengthening of the second radical audible¹.

The *perfect* **נִסְּבָה** (for **נִסְּבָה**) Num. 17, 28. Ps. 64, 7 (Jer. 44, 18 **נִסְּבָה** with *e Sillug*), owing to omission of the separating vowel, approximates, if the text is right, to the form of verbs *Y'y* (comp. **נִסְּבָה** from **נִסְּבָה**).

5. Since the preformatives of the *imperfect Qal*, of the *perfect f* *Niph'al*, and of *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* throughout, before a monosyllabic stem form an open syllable, they take a *long* vowel before the tone (according to § 27. 2, *a*), e. g. *imperfect Hiph'il* **יִסְּבָה** for *yā-sēb*, *imperative* **יִסְּבֵה** for *hā-sēb*, &c. Where the preformatives in the strong verb have *ī*, either the original *ā* (which was attenuated to *ī*) is restored and lengthened, e. g. **יִסְּבָה** in *imperfect Qal* for *yā-sōb*, or the *ī* itself is lengthened to *ē*, e. g. **יִסְּבֵה** *perfect Hiph'il* for *hī-sēb* (see further under letter *h*). The vowel thus lengthened can be retained, however, only before the tone (except the *ā* of the *Hoph'al*, lengthened from an original *ā*, **יִסְּבָה** for *hū-sāb*); when the tone is thrown forward it becomes *Šwā*, according to § 27. 3 (under *š* and *ṭ* compound *Šwā*), e. g. **יִסְּבָה**, but **יִסְּבֵה**; *imperfect Hiph'il* **יִסְּבָה**, but **יִסְּבֵה**; *perfect* **יִסְּבָה**, &c.

Besides the ordinary form of the imperfects, there is another which predominates *g* in *Aramaic*, in which the *imperfect Qal* is pronounced **יִסְּבָה**, the *first* radical, not the second, being strengthened by *Dageš forte*, comp. **יִסְּבָה** 1 Ki. 9, 8, **יִסְּבָה** Gen. 24, 26, **יִסְּבָה**; with *a* in the second syllable, **יִסְּבָה** Lev. 11, 7, **יִסְּבָה** (with *Dageš forte implicitum*) 1 Ki. 1, 1; in the plural, **יִסְּבָה** Num. 14, 35, &c. (in pause **יִסְּבָה**).

¹ No satisfactory explanation of these separating vowels has as yet been found. In none of the forms can it be said that the original vowel has returned, although König calls both separating vowels vocalic endings of the stem (*Vokalstamm-auslaute*), and regards the *u* of the imperfect as differentiated from *u*, *ē*. Consequently there remains only the supposition that we have here the insertion of a really new vowel, as an aid to pronunciation, with the object mentioned above. Rödiger, both for the *perfect* and *imperfect* (Ewald and Stade, for the *imperfect* at least), points to the analogy of verbs *h'h* in formations like **יִסְּבָה**, **יִסְּבָה**; but in those instances, the tone-bearing vowel is no new importation, but was there from the first. On the other hand, Rödiger notes the analogy of the vulgar Arabic (comp. Spitta's *Gr.*, p. 216), which for the classical Arabic *maddāta*, *maddāti*, *maddātu*, uses the forms *maddāt*, *maddāti*, *maddāt*, and even *maddāt*. The last of these forms might indicate that the *δ* in the *perfect* of Hebrew verbs *y'y* is obscured from an original *δ*; comp., however, G. Hoffmann in *ZDMG.* xxxii. p. 756, according to whom *maddāta* has arisen rather from *maddānta*, which he holds to be also the ground-form of **יִסְּבָה**. [See also Wright, *Comp. Gr.* 229 f.]

Ps. 102, 28); perhaps also יָמַל, יָדַל, יָמַן, יָמַח (unless these four forms are rather to be referred to *Niph'al*, as certainly יָדַח is, 1 Sam. 2, 9); with suffix הִתְקַבֵּץ occurs (comp. § 10. *h*) in Num. 23, 25; *Imperfect Hiph'il* יִתְחַם, *Hoph'al* יִתְחַח, &c. This sharpening of the first radical obviously only serves the purpose of giving to a biliteral stem at least a triliteral appearance¹; at the same time, the vowel of the preformative (which before *Dageš* is, of course, short) follows the analogy of the ordinary strong form (comp., also, letters *u* and *y*). The same method is then extended to forms with affirmatives or suffixes, so that even before these additions the second radical is not doubled, e.g. יִקְרֹו Gen. 43, 28 and elsewhere for יִקְרֹוּ and they bowed the head; יִכְרֹוּ and they beat down, Deut. 1, 44 (from יִכְרֹחַ); יִתְחַמוּ Deut. 32, 8; יִדְחוּ Exod. 15, 16. Job 29, 21 (comp., however, יִתְחַמוּ Jud. 18, 23, יִתְחַמוּ Jer. 46, 5. Job 4, 20). To the same class of apparently strong formations belongs הִתְעַלְעַלָּה (without the separating vowel, for הִתְעַלְעַלָּה, comp. 1 Sam. 3, 11 and below, letter *p*) they shall tingle, 2 Ki. 21, 12. Jer. 19, 3. On the various forms of the *Niph'al*, see Rem. 5.

h 6. The restoration of the original vowel, as mentioned in No. 5, occurs (*a*) in the preformative of the *imperfect Qal* יִכַּב for *yā-sōb* (comp. §§ 47. *b*, 63. *b*, and for verbs י'ע' § 72); (*b*) in the *perfect Niph'al* נִכַּב for *nā-sāb* (§ 51. *a*), as well as in the *imperfect* יִכַּב (comp. on *ā* in the final syllable of strong *imperfects Niph'al*, § 51. *m*); (*c*) in *Hoph'al* וִיכַב, with irregular lengthening for *hōsāb* from *hū-sab*, *imperfect* יִכַּב from *yū-sab*, &c.

i On the other hand, an already attenuated vowel (*i*) underlies the intransitive *imperfects Qal* with *ā* in the second syllable (probably for the sake of dissimilating the two vowels), e.g. יִמַּר for *yī-mār* (see letter *p*); and in the preformative of *Hiph'il* הִיכַב from *hī-sēb* (ground-form הִקְטַל, § 53. 1). In the second syllable of this form the underlying vowel is *i*, attenuated from an original *ā*, which in the strong verb is abnormally lengthened to *ī* (§ 53. 1). The *ē* lengthened from *i* is, of course, only tone-long, and hence when without the tone, and before *Dageš forte* we have e.g. הִקְטַל. On the return of the original *ā* in the second syllable, comp. letter *v*.

k 7. The *tone*, as a general rule, tends to keep to the stem-syllable, and thus does not (as in the strong verb) pass to the affirmatives הִתְקַבֵּץ, י and '— (2nd *sing. fem. imperfect*); e.g. 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* הִתְקַבֵּץ, in *pause* הִתְקַבֵּץ; with *ר* and gutturals הִתְקַבֵּץ (for הִתְקַבֵּץ, Ps. 44, 26; on the other hand, with *wāw consecutive* וְהִתְקַבֵּץ Is. 6, 12 (but וְהִתְקַבֵּץ

¹ Possibly the analogy of verbs י'ד may also have had some influence, as Paul Haupt has suggested verbally to the writer.

Ex. 1, 16). In the 3rd *plur. perfect* the tone varies; along with *יָלַד*, *יָלְדוּ*, we also find *יָלְדוּ* and *יָלְדוּ* Is. 59, 12, *שָׁחַ* Hab. 3, 6, &c.; but in *pause* always *הָיָה*, *הָיָה*, &c. The tone likewise remains on the stem-syllable in the *imperfect Qal* in *יִבְרַח*, *יִבְרַח*; *perfect Hiph'il* *הִבְרִיחַ*, *הִבְרִיחַ*; *imperfect* *יִבְרַח*, *יִבְרַח*, &c. In the forms with separating vowels, the tone is moved forward to these vowels (or to the final syllable, comp. Rem. 12), e.g. *קָבַח*, *קָבַח*, &c.; except before the endings *הָ* and *הֶן* in the *perfect*, which always bear the tone. This shifting of the tone naturally causes the shortening of the merely tone-long vowels *ē* and *ō* to *i* and *u* (δ, see letter *n*), hence *הִבְרִיחַ* from *הִבְרַח*, *הִבְרִיחַ* from *יִבְרַח*: on the vowel of the preformative becoming *Š'wā*, see above, letter *f*.

8. In numerous verbs *y'y*, instead of *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*, *l* the less frequent conjugation *Pō'el* (§ 55. 1), with its passive and reflexive, occurs, generally with the same meaning¹, e.g. *עָלַל* to treat ill, passive *עוֹלָל*, reflexive *הִתְעוֹלָל* (from *עָלַל*; comp. the *Hithpō'el* from *רָעַע* and *פָּרַר* Is. 24, 19 sq.); in a few also *Pilpēl* (§ 55. 4) is found, e.g. *גָּלַל* to roll, *Hithpalpēl* *הִתְגָּלַל* to roll oneself (from *גָּלַל*; *שָׂעִשַׁע* to comfort, to delight in; passive *שָׁעִשַׁע* to be caressed (from *שָׂעִשַׁע*). These forms cannot appear in a biliteral form any more than *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el*.—For *תִּתְבָּרַר* 2 Sam. 22, 27 read, according to Ps. 18, 27, *תִּתְבָּרַר*.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

1. In the *perfect*, isolated examples are found with *Hōlēm* in the first syllable, *m* which it is customary to refer to trilateral stems with middle *ō* (like *יָכַל*, § 43. a); viz. *רָמוּ* to *רָמוּ* they are exalted, Job 24, 24; *רָבוּ* to *רָבוּ* they shot, Gen. 49, 23; *וָרָו* Is. 1, 6 to *וָרָו*. But this explanation is very doubtful: *וָרָו* especially is rather to be classed among the passives of *Qal* mentioned in § 52. e.

2. *Imperfects Qal* with *ō* in the second syllable keep the original *a* in the preformative, but lengthen it to *ā*, as being in an open syllable, hence *יָחַן*, *יָחַר*, *יָעוּ*, *יָרָן*; imperfects with *ā* have, in the preformative, an *ē*, lengthened from *i*. See examples below, letter *p*, and § 63. c and e, § 72. h, and specially Barth in *ZDMG*. 1894, p. 5 sq.

¹ Sometimes both *Pi'el* and *Pō'el* are formed from the same stem, though with a difference of meaning, e.g. *רָצַץ* to break in pieces, *רָצַץ* to oppress; *חָנַן* to make pleasing, *חָנַן* to have pity; *הָלַל* to praise, *הָלַל* to make foolish; *סָבַב* to turn, to change, *סָבַב* to go round, to encompass.

The *Höllem* of the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* (בב, יבב) is only tone-long, and therefore, as a rule, is written defectively (with a few exceptions, chiefly in the later orthography, e.g. צור *bind up*, Is. 8, 16; גול Ps. 37, 5; דום ver. 7; לבז for לבו *to plunder*, Esth. 3, 13. 8, 11). When this *o* loses the tone, it becomes in the final syllable *o*, in a sharpened syllable *u*, or not infrequently even *o* (see above, letter *h*). Examples of *o* are: (a) in a toneless final syllable, i. e. before *Magqeph* or in the *imperfect consecutive*, רן (*rōn*) *to rejoice*, Job 38, 7; ויבב Jud. 11, 18 (once even with *u* in a toneless final syllable, ויבב Ex. 16, 20); on the other hand, in the *plur.* ויבבו, *fem.* ויבבנה; (b) before a tone-bearing *affirmative* or *suffix*, e.g. *imperative and sing. fem.* רבי, רבי (comp. letter *f*); ויבבי *pity me*; Jer. 50, 26; ויבבם Prov. 11, 3 *Qrd*; ויבבנה Ex. 12, 14; for the defective writing, cf. ויבבה Job 40, 22. In ויבבה Gen. 43, 29. Is. 30, 19 (for ויבבה) this *o* is thrown back to the preformative.

- o Quite abnormal is the *infinitive absolute* רע Is. 24, 19 (as ה follows, probably only a case of dittography for רע, comp. לב Num. 23, 25 and של Ruth 2, 16); so also are the *imperatives* קבהלי Num. 22, 11. 17, and ארהלי 22, 6. 23, 7, with ה *paragogic*. We should expect קבה, ארה (comp. ערה Is. 32, 11). If these forms are to be read *qōballi*, 'dralli, they would be analogous to such cases as מרבה (§ 90. f), the addition of the *paragogic* ה causing no change in the form of the word (קב *qōb* like רן above). If, however, as Jewish tradition requires, they are to be read *qāballi*, 'āralli, then in both cases the *Qameṣ* would have to be explained, with Stade, as the equivalent of an *o* (קבהלי, &c.; comp. § 9. v). Still more striking is קבנו *curse him*, Num. 23, 13, for קבנו or קב.

- p 3. Examples with *Pathah* in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect* are בר (in לברם *to prove them*, Eccles. 3, 18); דר *to trample down*, Is. 45, 1; שר Jer. 5, 26; perhaps also בששם *in their error*, Gen. 6, 3 (Baer, following the versions and the Masora, (בששם). Also גל *take away*, Ps. 119, 22; and the *imperfects* יחם *it is hot*, Deut. 19, 6 &c. (on the *ē* cf. letter *n*); יצר *it is bitter*, Is. 24, 9; יצר *it is straitened*; יר *it is soft*, Is. 7, 4; ירשם *it is desolate*, Ezek. 12, 19 (in pause ירשם Gen. 47, 19); ויבב she was despised, Gen. 16, 4 (but elsewhere in the *imperf. consec.* with the tone on the penultima, e.g. ויבב Gen. 32, 8 and elsewhere; ויבב Gen. 21, 11 and elsewhere, comp. Ezek. 19, 7); in the 1st *sing. imperfect* יבבם Ps. 19, 14, contrary to rule written fully for יבבם, unless יבבם is to be read, as in some MSS., on the analogy of the 3rd *sing.* יבב.—The following forms are to be explained with Barth (*ZDMG.* xliii. p. 178) as *imperfects Qal* with original *ʾ* in the second syllable, there being no instances of their *Hiph'il* in the same sense: ויבב Gen. 29, 10; ויבב Is. 31, 5, &c.; ויבב Ex. 40, 21. Ps. 91, 4, &c.; perhaps also ויבב 1 Sam. 3, 11 and ויבב Job 31, 26, &c.; in accordance

¹ For ו as suffix of the 3rd person a parallel might be found in ויבב, § 100. o, and probably in the *Nāḥ* of the Phœnician suffix ונ; cf. Barth, *ZDMG.* xli. p. 643.

² Also in Ezek. 6, 6, instead of ויבב, which could only come from ויבב, ויבב is intended, and ויבב in the same verse is probably only an error for ויבב.

with this last form, הָלַל (ב) Job 29, 3 would also be an *infinitive Qal*, not Hiph'il (for הָלַלְתָּ), as formerly explained below, letter *w*. Finally the very peculiar form הָלַלְתָּ Jud. 9, 53 may probably be added to the list. 777

Imperfects, with an original *u* in the second syllable, are also found with this *u* lengthened to *u* (instead of *o*), e.g. *וַיִּרְץ*, if the text is correct, in Prov. 29, 6; *וַיִּשָׁדַד* Ps. 91, 6 (unless it be simply an imperfect from *וַיִּשָׁדַד* to be powerful, to prevail); *וַיִּרְץ* (if from *וַיִּרְץ*) Is. 42, 4 and elsewhere (also defectively written *וַיִּרְץ* Ps. 18, 30; but in Eccles. 12, 6, according to Baer, *וַיִּרְץ*); *וַיִּרְץ* Ezek. 24, 11 (on the sharpening of the *ץ* cf. letter *ץ* above)¹.

A similar analogy with verbs וָעָז is seen in the infinitives לָבֹר (בָּר) Eccles. 9, 1; בָּרוּךְ Prov. 8, 27 (comp. בָּרוּךְ Prov. 8, 29) for בָּרוּךְ, and in the imperfect אֶסְפֹּךְ Gen. 27, 21. Infinitives in הָ (on the analogy of verbs לָ) are הַפֹּחַ in Ps. 77, 10, שֹׁפֵחַ Ezek. 36, 3; also with a suffix הַלֹּחִי הָיָה Ps. 77, 11. On other similar cases, see below, letter *ee*. For examples of the *aramaising imperfect*, see above, letter *g*.

4. In the *participle*, the aramazing form שִׁמְסִים for שִׁמְסִיָּה occurs in Kthibh, Jer. 30, 16 (the *Q^{re}* points to a *participle* from שִׁמַּס); in רָעָה Prov. 25, 19, there appears to be a contraction from רָעָעָה, *part. fem.* = *breaking in pieces*.

II. On Niph'al.

5. Besides the ordinary form of the *perfect* נָסַבּ with *Pathah* (in *pause* נָסַבּ) and the *participle* נֹסֵב with *Qameṣ* in the second syllable, there is also another with *Ṣere*, and a third with *Holem*, e.g. *perfect* נָסַל it is a light thing (also נָסַל), Is. 49, 6; נֹסֵל (for נֹסֵב) Ezek. 26, 2; *part.* נֹסֵם (comp., however, § 75. y), *mollen*, *refuse*, 1 Sam. 15, 9; with *ō*, e.g. נִלְוּ they are rolled together, Is. 34, 4; comp. 63, 19. 64, 2. Amos 3, 11. Nah. 1, 12. Eccles. 12, 6 b. In the *imperfect*, on the analogy of verbs נָלַץ (from which König would also explain the *perfects* with *ō*), we find נִלְוִי thou shalt be brought to silence, Jer. 48, 2 (unless this form should be referred to *Qal*); נִלְרִי (for *lirrōy*) Ezek. 29, 7; with *ē* in the second syllable נִלְלִ she profanes herself, Lev. 21, 9, but נִלְלִ Ezek. 22, 26, and נִלְלִ Is. 48, 11. For *infinitives*, cf. הָמַס to melt, Ps. 68, 3 (as *inf. constr.*; 2 Sam. 17, 10 as *inf. absol.*); moreover, with compensatory lengthening in the first syllable, הִחֵל Ezek. 20, 9. 14. 22, but with suffix הִחֵלִי Lev. 21, 4; also הִפְזוּ to be plundered, and הִבְזוּ to be emptied, Is. 24, 3; in the *imperative* only, הִבְדּוּ be ye clean, Is. 52, 11. On הִרְפוּ get you up, Num. 17, 10, *imperf.*, Ezek. 10, 17 and elsewhere, comp. § 72. dd.

Examples of the *perfect Niph'al* with sharpening of the initial syllable are, נָחַל *it is profaned*, Ezek. 22, 16. 25, 3 (from נָחַר); נָחַר (from נָחַר) Ps. 69, 4. 102, 4 (also נָחַר Jer. 6, 29); נָחַח *fractus est* (from נָחַח) Mal. 2, 5; comp. with this in the *participle*, נָחִיחַ (for *niphātm*) Is. 57, 5, and נָחִיחַ Mal. 3, 9; in the

¹ According to Stade, *Grammatik*, § 95, Rem., the pronunciation with *d*, since it also appears in Neo-Punic [and in Western Syriac, see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.*, § 48], was that of everyday life.

imperative and *infinitive Niph'al* such a virtual doubling of the guttural after preformatives never occurs.—The occurrence of *u* instead of *δ* as a separating vowel in the *perfect* נִשְׁבַּח Mic. 2, 4 is abnormal.

III. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

- v 6. The second syllable in *Hiph'il* has *Pathah* instead of *Sere*, especially under the influence of ר and the gutturals, e.g. *perfect* הִמְרָה he made bitter, הִשָּׁחוּ he bowed, הִפְרָה he hath broken, Gen. 17, 14, in *pause*, comp. § 29. q; otherwise הִפְרָה, plur. הִפְרוּ Is. 24, 5; in הִפְרִיר Ps. 33, 10. Ezek. 17, 19, comp. Ps. 89, 34, and also in הִשְׁרִיר Hos. 8, 4 (perhaps also in יִחְיֶה Hab. 2, 17, but comp. § 20. n) there is an assimilation to the corresponding forms of verbs פִּעַץ, see letter *s*, while conversely, in הִחַו Is. 18, 5 from הִחַי, an ע"ו verb is assimilated to a פִּעַץ verb. Also הִצַּר Deut. 28, 52; *inf.* לְהַבֵּר to cleanse, Jer. 4, 11, in *pause*; but also with other consonants, e.g. הִרַק 2 Ki. 23, 15, הִקַּל Is. 8, 23; הִרָה Job 23, 16; plur. הִקְצִיבוּ 1 Sam. 5, 9. 10 (and so usually in the 3rd plur. *perf.*, except before ר and gutturals, e.g. הִרְעִי *imper.* הִשָּׁע besmear, Is. 6, 10; plur. הִשְׁפִּיחוּ be astonished, Job 21, 5; *imperfect* תִּרְעַ Thou dost afflict; *part.* מַצֵּל shadowing, Ezek. 31, 3 (but מְסִיחַ Jud. 3, 24 is assimilated to the form of verbs פִּעַץ. So in the *imperative* הִמְשִׁיחֵנִי Jud. 16, 26 *Q'rd*, and in the *infinitive* הִתְמַסְּךָ Is. 33, 1).

- w The *ē* of the second syllable, when without the tone, may become *z*, e.g. הִתַּל Gen. 31, 7 (comp. also letter *x*). It is unusual (cf. § 53. k) to find the *ē* written fully as in the *infinitive* לְהַפְסִיר Zech. 11, 10. Instead of *Hateph-Pathah* a *Hateph-Sghol* is found under the Preformative in הִקְלַתְנִי 2 Sam. 19, 44, and a *Pathah* occurs before ח (with a virtual sharpening of the ח) in such forms as הִחַרְתִּי Is. 9, 3; comp. Gen. 11, 6. Deut. 2, 31, 3, 24. 1 Sam. 22, 15. Esth. 6, 13—in all these cases before ח. On בִּהַלְוָה Job 29, 3, see above, letter *p*: on הִחַרְתִּי Jer. 49, 37, see below, letter *dd*.

- x 7. In the *imperfect consecutive* of verbs, whose second radical is a guttural, *δ* is retained (§ 22. d) in the second syllable instead of *z*, e.g. יִרְעֶה 1 Ki. 6, 11: so also when the second radical is ר, as יִרְעַר 2 Chron. 28, 20. Deut. 2, 9—but cf. also יִרְפָּר Neh. 4, 9.

- y 8. Aramaizing forms in *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* are, וִיפְסֹב Ex. 13, 18; comp. Jud. 18, 23; וִיפְרֹחַ Exod. 23, 21; וִיפְרוּ Deut. 1, 44 (comp. Num. 14, 45); וִיפְסֹב profanabo, Ezek. 39, 7; וִיפְסֹב Job 22, 3; without syncope of the ה (comp. § 53. q), וִיפְסֹב 1 Ki. 18, 27; with *z* in the second syllable וִישִׁים Jer. 49, 20. 50, 45; comp. וִישִׁים Num. 21, 30; in the *perfect* הִיבִילוּ Lam. 1, 8. In *Hoph'al*, הִפְסִיכוּ they are brought low, Job 24, 24; יִפֹּחַ he is smitten, Is. 24, 12 (plur. Jer. 46, 5. Mic. 1, 7); in *pause*, יִפְחוּ Job 19, 23, but also יִפְחוּ Job 4, 20; with *δ* in the initial syllable, הִפְסִיחוּ (*infinitive* with suffix = הִשְׁפִּיחוּ, comp. § 91. e) Lev. 26, 34 sq., comp. 2 Chron. 36, 21; בִּהַלְוָה, with irregular syncope for בִּהַלְוָה, Lev. 26, 43.

IV. In General.

- g 9. Verbs פִּעַץ are most nearly related as regards inflexion to verbs פִּעַץ (§ 72). The form of verbs פִּעַץ is generally the shorter (comp. e.g. יָקַב and יָקַח, הִקַּב

Qal, הָצִיר Is. 49, 19 (*plur. masc.* Job 18, 7); יָרַע Neh. 2, 3; הִשְׁמַח Ezek. 6, 6 (for which הִישׁ = הִישׁ ought to be read) might also be explained in the same way.—*Perfect Niph'al* נִסְכַּח for נִסְכַּח Ezek. 41, 7; נָלַז Jud. 5, 5 for נָלַז; נִמְלָחָם for נִמְלָחָם Gen. 17, 11 (as if from נָלַל not נָלַל to circumcise), comp. Is. 19, 3. Jer. 8, 14; *Imperfect Hiph'il* הִמְסִיחַ Zech. 14, 12; *Participle* נִמְלָחָם, comp. letter *u*. So also נָפַץ 1 Sam. 13, 11, נִפְצָה Gen. 9, 19 (comp. Is. 33, 3), are perfects *Niph'al* from נָפַץ (= נָפַץ), not *Qal* from נָפַץ.—In *Hiph'il* הִתְלַחַת (for הִתְלַחַת) Jud. 16, 10 (2 Sam. 15, 34); הִתְעָה for הִתְעָה Prov. 7, 13 (cf. Cant. 6, 11, 7, 13), and the very strange form הִתְחַלַּח Jer. 49, 37 (from *hahlat*-*it*) from חָלַח.

No less irregular is the suppression of the vowel of the stem-syllable in לִתְפַּרֵּם Lev. 26, 15.—On the perfect הִלִּי Prov. 26, 7, comp. § 75, letter *u*.

ee 12. Instances in which the tone is thrown forward on the affirmatives (see letter *k*) are (a) in the *perfect*, the 1st *sing.* regularly (but cf. וְהִצִּירְתִּי Jer. 10, 18 before לָהֶם) after 1 *consec.*, Ex. 33, 19. 22. 2 Ki. 19, 34, &c., also Is. 44, 16 (וְהִפְוִתִּי before רַ); Ps. 17, 3. 92, 11. 116, 6, perhaps also Job 19, 17, וְהִפְוִתִּי (though in this passage, and in Ps. 17, 3, the form might be an *infinitive* in *dh*; see above, letter *r*, and Delitzsch on Job 19, 17); in the 2nd *sing.* וְתִצְוֶנָה (before א) Deut. 25, 12; in the 3rd *plural*, רָבּוּ *multi sunt*, Ps. 3, 2. 104, 24. Jer. 5, 6. 1 Sam. 25, 10; רָבּוּ *they are soft*, Ps. 55, 22; קָלּוּ *they are swift*, Jer. 4, 13. Hab. 1, 8; נָפְּוּ *they are pure*, Job 15, 15. 25, 5. Lam. 4, 7; שָׁרְוּ *they did bow*, Hab. 3, 6; חָרְוּ *they are burned*, Is. 24, 6. A by-form of שָׁרַו (שָׁרַו, comp. § 72. *dd*) is שָׁרְוּ Ps. 49, 15. 73, 9.

ff (b) In the *imperative* (a command in an emphatic tone) רָצִי *sing.*, Is. 54, 1. Zeph. 3, 14. Zech. 2, 14; רָצִי Is. 44, 23. 49, 13. Jer. 31, 7 (but רָצִי *cry out*, Lam. 2, 19), קִיץ *keep (thy feasts)*, Nah. 2, 1. Jer. 7, 29; עֲזָה (= עֲזָה) before א, Ps. 68, 29. On the return of the short vowels *a* (*δ*) and *i* before *Dageš forte*, in place of the tone-long *ō* and *ē*, see above, letter *k*; on the change of the vowels of the preformative into *šwā*, when they no longer stand before the tone, see letter *g*.

THE WEAKEST VERBS (*Verba Quiescentia*).

§ 68. Verbs א"ב, e.g. אָכַל to eat.

a So far as א retains its full consonantal value as a guttural, these verbs share all the peculiarities of verbs *primæ gutturalis*, mentioned in § 63. They are, however, to be treated as *weak* verbs, when the א loses its value as a consonant, and coalesces with the preceding vowel (originally short) to form one long syllable. This takes place only in the following very common verbs and forms, as if through phonetic decay:—

b 1. In the *imperfect Qal*, five verbs (viz. אָבַד to perish, אָבַח to be willing, אָכַל to eat, אָמַר to say, אָפַק to bake) regularly allow the א to

quiesce in a long *ē*, e. g. יֹאכֵל¹. In a few others the ordinary (strong) form is also in use, as יֹאחֵז (18 times) and יֹאחֶז (3 times) *he takes hold*; יֹאסֵף (see letter *h*), also יֹאסֶף, *he collects*. This *ē* has primarily arisen from an obscuring of *d* (§ 9. *g*), and the *d* from אֶ—, the weak consonant א coalescing with *ā* to *d*; comp. § 23. *a*.

In the second syllable the *ō* (for the original *ū*) never appears, but either *ē*² or *ā*; and in *pause* almost always *ē*, even before the tone-bearing heavy affirmative ו, e. g. יֹאכֵלֶנּוּ Deut. 18, 1, without the pause יֹאכֵלֶנּוּ Deut. 4, 28. In the 3rd sing. masc. and 1st sing. of יֹאמֵר, however, *ā* is always retained in *pause*, יֹאמֵר and יֹאמֶר, cf. also יֹאמֵר 1 Sam. 1, 7, &c. But with conjunctive accents in continuous discourse, *ā* (as being a lighter vowel) is used, e. g. יֹאמֵר לְעַד Ps. 9, 19, but in *pause* יֹאמֵר Ps. 1, 6; יֹאמֵר 1 Ki. 5, 2; comp. a similar interchange of *ē* and *ā* in § 65. *c*.

When the tone moves back, the final syllable of the *imperfects* of *d* יֹאכֵד and יֹאכֵל, with a conjunctive accent, always takes *Pathah*, e. g. יֹאכֵד יוֹם Job 3, 3, יֹאכֵל and *he did eat*; in יֹאמֵר the loss of the tone from the final syllable only occurs in the form with *wāw* consecutive (but never in the 1st sing., יֹאמֵר, cf. יֹאכֵל), and then the final syllable, if without the *pause*, always takes *Sghöl*, יֹאמֵר and *he said*.

In *pause*, however, the *imperfect consecutive* always has the form יֹאכֵל (but *plug* always יֹאכֵל, יֹאכֵל, יֹאמֵר; except יֹאמֵר in the poetic portion of the Book of Job, as 3, 2. 4, 1, &c., but not in 32, 6, in the middle of the verse; comp. also יֹאמֵר לְךָ Prov. 7, 13. The weak *imperfect* of יֹאחֵז is always יֹאחֵז and יֹאחֶז, but in the 1st sing., according to § 49. *e*, יֹאחֶז Jud. 20, 6; comp. יֹאכֵל Gen. 3, 12. 13 in *pause*.—יֹאכֵד and יֹאכֵל are, at the same time, verbs ל'ה, hence *imperfect* יֹאכֵד (§ 75. *c*).

Before *light* suffixes the vowel of the second syllable becomes vocal Šwā, as יֹאכֵלֶנּוּ, but יֹאכֵלֶנּוּ. In a few cases, instead of the *ē* in the first

¹ So in the vulgar Arabic as now spoken in South Palestine, *ya'kul* (*he eats*) becomes *yōkul*.

² On this *ē* (originally *r*) as a dissimilation from *ō* (originally *ū*), cf. § 27. *x*, and F. Philippi in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, Bd. xiv. 2, p. 178. The latter rightly observes that the existence of an original *u* in the *imperfect* of יֹאכֵל is indicated by the form of the *imperative* יֹאכֵל, the Arabic *ya'kul*, and the Aramaic יֹאכֵל, as well as by the fact that יֹאחֵז and יֹאסֵף are found along with יֹאחֶז and יֹאסֶף.

Paradigm I shows the weak forms of the *imperfect Qal*, and merely indicates the other conjugations, which are regular.

Rem. 1. In the derived conjugations only isolated weak forms occur: *Perfect* i Niphal נִאֲחֹז Num. 32, 30. Jos. 22, 9; *Hiph.* הִרְבַּ (for וְיִרְבֹּב) and he laid wait, 1 Sam. 15, 5; אָזַן I listen, Job 32, 11; אָכַל (ð from d) I give to eat, Hos. 11, 4; אֲבִידָה (ð from d) I will destroy, Jer. 46, 8; וַיִּחָר 2 Sam. 20, 5 Q^{re} (for וַיִּחָרֵר); the *K'ithb* appears to require the *Pi'el* וַיִּחָרֵר from יָחַר as a secondary form of אָחַר; but וַיִּחָרֵר = וַיִּאֲחַר for וַיִּאֲחַר as *imperfect Qal* is not impossible. On וַיִּאֲחַר Neh. 13, 13, comp. § 53. n.—*Infinitive* לְהַכִּיל Ezek. 21, 33 (= לְהַאֲכִיל unless it is rather *infin. Hiph.* from הָכִיל); *Participle* מְזַן giveth ear, Prov. 17, 4. *Imperative* הָרְתִי bring (from אָתַת) Jer. 12, 9. (On the same form used for the *perfect* in Is. 21, 14, comp. § 76. d.)

2. In the *Pi'el* the *N* is sometimes dropped by syncope, like ה in יִחָסֵל, יִחָסֵל, thus סִלַּח (as in Aramaic and Samaritan) teaching, for מִסִּלַּח Job 35, 11; יָחַל for יִאֲחַל Is. 13, 20; וְתִקְרִי thou hast girded me, 2 Sam. 22, 40, for וְתִקְרִי, as Ps. 18, 40; וַאֲבִידָה Ezek. 28, 16; comp. § 23. d.

§ 69. Verbs ו'ד. First Class, or Verbs originally ו'ד, e.g. יָשַׁב to dwell.

Verbs which at present begin with *Yôdh* in their simple form (i.e. *a* when without preformatives), are divided into two classes according to their origin and hence frequently in their inflexion: (a) Verbs which (as still in Arabic and Ethiopic) originally began with *Wāw*, e.g. לָדַע to give birth to, Arab. and Eth. *wālādā*. In consequence of a phonetic change which prevails also with few exceptions in the noun, this *Wāw* in Hebrew and Aramaic always becomes a *Yôdh*, at least when it is the initial consonant; but after preformatives it either reappears, or is again changed into *Yôdh*, or, lastly, is altogether elided; (b) Verbs which (as in Arabic) originally began with *Yôdh* (called *Verba cum Iod originario*, see § 70). A few verbs (some with original *Yôdh*, and some with original *Wāw*) form a special class, which in certain forms assimilates the *Wāw* or *Yôdh* to the following consonant on the analogy of the *Nûn* in verbs ו'ד (see § 71).

With regard to verbs ו'ד (i.e. ו'ד with original *Wāw*) it is to be noticed that—

1. In the *imperfect*, *imperative* and *infinitive construct Qal* there is a twofold inflexion, according as the *Wāw* is wholly rejected or only changed into *Yôdh*. The complete rejection (or *elision*) takes place regularly in eight verbs (see letter *h*) on the analogy of the following:

A. *Imperfect* יִשָּׁב, יִדַּע with an unchangeable¹ *Sere* in the first syllable and original *i* in the second, which in the tone-syllable (according to § 27. c) becomes *ē* (thus יִלָּךְ, יִצָּא, יִדָּר, יִלָּךְ), or under the influence of a guttural with *ā* in the second (יִדַּע, יִשָּׁע, יִחַד).

The tone-long *ē* of the second syllable is of course liable to the shortening to *Sghöl* or vocal *Šwā*, e.g. יִשָּׁב, יִשָּׁב, &c.; in the same way *ā* becomes *Šwā* in such cases as יִדַּע, &c., but is lengthened to *Qameṣ* in pause (יִדַּעַ) and before suffixes (יִדַּעַם).

B. *Imperative* שָׁב with *aphaeresis* of the *Wāw* and with tone-long *ē*, from *i*, as in the *imperfect*.

C. *Infinitive* שָׁבַת from original *šibh*, by addition of the feminine ending (ת) lengthened to a *segholate* form; as in verbs מָנַח (comp. § 66. δ) this lengthening affords a certain compensation for loss of the initial consonant.

¹ The *e* of the first syllable is really *ē*, not tone-long *ē*; thus *yīwšib*, with the first *i* attenuated from *ā*, after elision of the *Wāw* must have been lengthened to *yēšib*, as it was still explained, with Ewald and others, in the twenty-third edition of this Grammar. The character of this *e* is seen from the fact that it is retained not merely before the tone, and in the counter-tone (e.g. יִדַּעַם Hos. 14, 10), but also in אִדַּעַ Ex. 33, 13. 17. Its explanation, however, presents great difficulty. The view that original *yawšib* became *yayšib*, and then *yēšib*, *yēšib* (so still König, *Lehrgeb.*, p. 401), seems to be supported by the fact that, in Arabic, besides such *imperfects* as *yāllidū*, *yāšibū* (with complete elision of the *Wāw*) we also find in the dialects *yālid*, *yāšal*, &c., 1st *sing. aulid*, *aušal*, &c.; comp. Spitta, *Gramm. des Arab. Vulgärdial. v. Ägypten*, p. 223 sq.; on the corresponding strong formation in Ethiopic, comp. Dillmann, *Gramm.*, p. 146; Praetorius, § 93. But how comes then the almost invariable *scriptio defectiva* of this *ē*? From an original *yī* we should expect, according to § 7. g, a prevalence of the *scriptio plena*; in reality it occurs (with the exception of יִדַּע Ps. 72, 14, elsewhere pointed יִדַּעַ) only in Mic. 1, 8 and Ezek. 35, 9 *Kth*; in Ps. 138, 6 the Masora prefers to point יִדַּעַ.—According to Stade (*Gramm.*, §§ 108, 117 a) the original *i* of the second syllable has exercised a backward influence upon the original *ā* of the first syllable, 'in consequence of which an *i* forces itself in after this *ā*, as it were by anticipation. The two coalesce into a diphthong, which is then merged into *ē*: הִקִּים *hēqim* for *haiqim* from *hagim*, Aramaic *'aqim*; מִקִּים from *maqim*, &c. The latter comparison must indeed be rejected, since the *e* in הִקִּים and מִקִּים is not unchangeable; but Stade's view has the advantage of attempting to explain at any rate the unchangeableness of the first *e* in יִשָּׁב and יִדַּע, which he likewise refers to an original *yadi*.—According to Philippi (*ZDMG*. xl. p. 653) an original *yālid*, for example (see above), became *yilid* by assimilation of the vowel of the first syllable to that of the second; this then became *yēlid* instead of *yēšid*, in an attempt to raise the word again in this way (by writing *ē* instead of *ē*) to a trilateral form.

Rem. Since the infinitives *לָרַח*, *לָרַח* (see below, letter *m*) point to a ground-form *di'at*, *lidat*, we must, with Philippi (*ZDMG.* xxxii. p. 42) and Barth (*ibid.* xli. p. 606), assign to *לָרַח*, &c., the ground-form *libt* (which, therefore, reappears in *לָרַח*, &c.); the apparent ground-form *labt* rests upon the law that the *l* of the stem-syllable is changed into *a* whenever the syllable becomes doubly closed by the addition of the vowelless feminine ending.

In more than half the number of verbs ו'ב the original *Wāw* in the *d* above-mentioned forms gives place to *Yōdh*, which in the *imperatives* *רָח*, *רָח* (see letter *f*) and *infinitive* *יָרַח* is a strong consonant, but in the *imperfect* *יָרַח*, properly *yiyraḥ*, merges with the preceding *i* into *f*.

In the second syllable *imperfects* of this form regularly have *ā*.

(a) That the latter forms are derived from verbs with an original *Wāw* (not *Yōdh*) is shown partly by the inflexion of these verbs in *Niph'al*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hoph'al* (where the original *Wāw* reappears throughout), and partly by the Arabic, in which verbs ו'ב likewise exhibit a twofold formation; comp. *wāḏāḏ*, imperf. *yāḏḏu*, with elision of the *Wāw*, and *wāḏāḏ*, *yāḏāḏu*, with retention of the *Wāw*.

(b) Sometimes both forms, the weaker and the stronger, occur in the same verb; *f* comp. *פָּרַח* 2 Ki. 4, 41 and *פָּרַח* *pour*, Ezek. 24, 3 (comp. *פָּרַח* 1 Ki. 18, 34 and the *inf.* *פָּרַח* Ex. 38, 27); *רָח* *take possession*, Deut. 1, 21. 1 Ki. 21, 15 (comp., however, letter *s*), *רָח* (in *pause* for *רָח*) Deut. 2, 24. 31; *plur.* *רָח* Deut. 1, 8. 9, 23, but also, with *ה*—*paragogic*, *רָח* Deut. 33, 23. In the *imperfect* *יָרַח* Deut. 32, 22 and *יָרַח* Is. 10, 16 *it shall be kindled*; *יָרַח* *it was precious*, 1 Sam. 18, 30 and *יָרַח* Ps. 49, 9 (comp. *יָרַח* Ps. 72, 14).—The form *וַיָּרַח* Gen. 30, 39, for *וַיָּרַח*, beside *וַיָּרַח* verse 38, is remarkable.

(c) On *רָח* Jud. 19, 11 for *רָח* and *שָׁח* Jer. 42, 10 for the *infinitive absolute* *שָׁח*, comp. § 19. *i*.—But *רָח* Jud. 5, 13 *a* and *b* is not intended by the Masora either as *perfect* (for *רָח*, which really should be restored) or as *imperative* of *רָח*, but as an apocopated *imperfect* *Pi'el* from *רָח* (= *וַיָּרַח*) *to have dominion*.

(d) The eight verbs¹, of which the initial consonant in the above-mentioned *h* forms always suffers elision or aphaeresis, are *יָרַח* *to bring forth*, *יָרַח* *to go forth*, *יָרַח* *to sit*, *to dwell*, *יָרַח* *to descend*, also *יָרַח* *to go* (comp. below, letter *x*); and with *ā* in the second syllable of the *imperfect*, *יָרַח* *to know*, *יָרַח* *to be united*, *יָרַח* *to be dislocated*. Examples of the other formation (*יָרַח* &c.) are *יָרַח* *to be wearied*, *יָרַח* *to counsel*, *יָרַח* *to sleep*, *יָרַח* (*imperfect* *יָרַח*) *to fear*.

¹ A ninth *יָרַח* *to add*, is also to be included. For since on the Mēša' stone, l. 21, the *infinitive* is not written *לְסַפֵּחַ* but *לְסַפַּח* (comp. *יָסַפַּח*, l. 29), we must also read in Is. 30, 1 (Num. 32, 14. Deut. 29, 18) *לְסַפַּח* for *לְסַפֵּחַ*. The 2nd *plur. masc. imperative* *סַפַּח* Is. 29, 1. Jer. 7, 21 corresponds to *שָׁכַח*; thus in proof of a supposed *סַפַּח* *addere*, there remains only *סַפַּח* Deut. 32, 23, for which, according to 2 Sam. 12, 8, *סַפַּח* is to be read.

- i* 2. The original *Wāw* is retained as a firm consonant; (a) in the *infinitive*, *imperative*, and *imperfect Niph'al*, being protected by the doubling, e.g. הָשִׁיב, הַשִּׁיב, which are consequently strong forms like הָשִׁיב, הַשִּׁיב; (b) in the *Hithpa'el* of some verbs, e.g. הִתְהַדַּע from דַּע, הִתְהַדַּח from דַּח, הִתְהַדַּח from דַּח; otherwise a radical *Wāw* at the beginning of a word is now found only in a few nouns, e.g. וָלֶךְ *proles* from לָךְ *to bear*. At the end of a syllable *Wāw* with the homogeneous vowel *ā* coalesces into *ā*; so throughout *Hoph'al*, e.g. הָשִׁיב for *hāwsabbh*; but with a preceding *a* the *Wāw* is contracted into *ō* (¹); so in the *perfect* and *participle Niph'al* and throughout *Hiph'il*, e.g. נָשַׁב from an original *nāwsābh*, הָשִׁיב from an original *hāwsābh*.
- k* The first radical always appears as *Yōdh* in the *perfect* and *participle Qal*, יָשַׁב, &c., יָשַׁב, יָשַׁב, even when י precedes, e.g. יָשַׁב (but יָשַׁבְתִּים), according to § 24. b), also throughout *Pi'el* and *Pu'al*, e.g. יָחַל *to wait*, יָלַד *to be born*, and in the *imperfect* and *participle Hithpa'el* יִחַל *known* (from דַּע), and, as a rule, also in *Hithpa'el*, e.g. הִתְהַלַּךְ, הִתְהַלַּח (as against הִתְהַדַּע, &c. with *Wāw*).
- l* The beginner may recognize verbs יָדַע in the *imperfect Qal* partly by the *Sere* under the preformatives; in *Niph'al*, *Hiph'il*, and *Hoph'al* by the *Wāw* (ו, ו, ו) before the second radical. (The defective writing, as in הוֹלִיד, is rare). Verbs יָדַע have forms like יָדַע, יָדַע, in common with verbs יָדַע. Similarly *Hoph'al* has the same form as in verbs יָדַע and יָדַע.
- m* Rem. 1. The *infinitive Qal* of the weaker form (שָׁכַח), ground-form *libt*, comp. above, letter c) with suffixes is pointed as שָׁכַחְתִּי¹, &c. The masculine form is very rare, e.g. יָדַע *to know*, Job 32, 6. 10, as also the feminine ending הָ, e.g. יָדַעְתִּי Ex. 2, 4, לָדַח Is. 37, 3 (2 Ki. 19, 3); Jer. 13, 21. Hos. 9, 11; מָדַח *to descend*, Gen. 46, 3, where the change of the *ē* into vocal *šwā* is to be explained, with König, from its position between the principal and secondary tone. From דַּע, under the influence of the guttural, דָּעַת is formed, with *suffix*. דָּעַתִּי &c.; but from יָצַח, יָצַח for יָצַח, see § 94. f. From יָדַע there occurs in Ps. 30, 4 in מְיֻדָּי (the *Kāth* requires מְיֻדָּי) a very remarkable case of the strong form (for מְיֻדָּי). For לָח 1 Sam. 4, 19 (generally explained as a case of

¹ וְשָׁכַחְתִּי Ps. 23, 6 can hardly be intended for an *infinitive* with suffix from וְשָׁכַח, but rather for a *perfect consecutive* from וְשָׁכַח; we should, however, read וְשָׁכַחְתִּי.

² The infinitives דָּעַח and דָּח belong to the source marked E (B by Dillmann) in the modern criticism of the Pentateuch. The same document also has נָתַן *to give*, for נָתַח; הָלַךְ *to go*, for הָלַח; and עָשָׂה *to make*, for עָשָׂח. See Dillmann, *Die BB. Num., Dent., Jos.*, p. 618.

assimilation of ל to נ in the supposed ground-form *ladt*; according to Mayer Lambert pausal of לָלַח = *lidd*, see above, letter c) read simply לָלַח.

Examples of the strong form of the *infinitive* are לָרֹא *to fear*, Jos. 22, 25, with preposition לִי־רֹא Is. 51, 16 (but 2 Chron. 31, 7 according to Ben Naphtali לִי־רֹא, where the י is only retained orthographically, but is really assimilated to the ב; the reading of Ben Asher, לִי־רֹא, accepted by Baer, is meaningless); לִישׁוֹן Eccles. 5, 11; לָרֹא 1 Sam. 18, 29 is irregular, probably, however, לָרֹא (for לִירֹא) is intended. With *suff.* לִישׁוֹן Job 38, 4, comp. Jud. 14, 15. Ezr. 3, 12; with *fem.* לִישׁוֹן *to be able*, Num. 14, 16. On לִישׁוֹן, which is likewise usually referred to this class, comp. the note on § 70. a.

2. The *imperative Qal* frequently has the lengthening by הָ, e.g. שִׁבָּה *sit thou*, יֵרֵד *descend thou*. From יָהֵב *to give*, Arab. *wāḥḥab*, only the *imperative* is used in Hebrew; it has the form הָיֵב *give*, lengthened הָיֵב generally with the meaning *age, go to* (Gen. 29, 21 הָיֵב before א to avoid the hiatus); *fem.* הָיְבִי Ruth 3, 15, *Mil'ra'* on the analogy of the plural הָיְבוּ (in Job 6, 22 הָיְבוּ before the tone-syllable; but comp. Deut. 32, 3), whilst, on the analogy of other *imperatives Qal* of verbs יָפַע, הָיְבִי, הָיְבוּ would rather be expected.—On יָפַע Prov. 24, 14, comp. § 48. l.

3. The *imperfect* with ו elided takes א in the second syllable, besides the cases mentioned above (letter f), also in יִפְדֶּה Jer. 13, 17 (comp. Lam. 3, 48) and in the pausal form יִפְדֶּה Job 27, 21 &c. (from יִפְדֶּה, see letter x); on יִפְדֶּה Is. 10, 16 see above, letter f. The א in the second syllable, when followed by the affirmative נָה (יִפְדֶּה נָה &c.), is in accordance with the law mentioned above (letter c), by which א takes the place of א in a doubly closed syllable. Forms with א in the second syllable shorten the א to *Sghol*, when the tone is drawn back (before a tone-syllable or after *wāw* consecutive), e.g. יִשְׁבֶּנָּה Gen. 44, 33; יִפְדֶּה, יִפְדֶּה; but א is retained in an open syllable, even with *Mil'el*-tone, in יִפְדֶּה Ex. 16, 29. Jud. 9, 39, in both cases with *nasog 'aḥor*, § 29. e. The *pausal* is either of the form יִשְׁבֶּה Ruth 4, 1 or יִפְדֶּה Ps. 18, 10; the 1st pers. sing., whether in or out of pause, is יִפְדֶּה, יִפְדֶּה &c., except יִפְדֶּה Job 19, 10, see letter x. For יִפְדֶּה Ps. 138, 6 (comp. the note above, on letter b and the analogous cases, § 70. d) יִפְדֶּה is intended.

The *imperfect* of the form יִפְדֶּה is frequently (especially before affirmatives) written defectively, in which case the f can always be recognized as a long vowel by the *Metheg* (see § 16. f), e.g. יִפְדֶּה Is. 40, 30, יִפְדֶּה Is. 65, 23; and so always יִפְדֶּה *they fear*, as distinguished from יִפְדֶּה *they see* (*imperf. Qal* of יִפְדֶּה).—On יִפְדֶּה Gen. 50, 26. 24, 33 *k'ah*, and יִפְדֶּה Ex. 30, 32, see § 73, letter f.

From יִפְדֶּה *to prevail, to be able*, the *imperfect Qal* is יִפְדֶּה, which can only have arisen through a depression of the vowel from יִפְדֶּה (ground-form *yaukhal* = *yaukhal*), to distinguish it, according to Qimḥi, from יִפְדֶּה, just as, according to § 47. b, יִפְדֶּה is differentiated from יִפְדֶּה. Comp. the Arabic *yauru'u* (*yōru'u*) from *waru'a*, *yauḡalu* (*yōḡalu*) from *waḡila*, as also the vulgar Arabic (among towns-people) *yūḡal* &c. from *waḡala*. Others regard יִפְדֶּה as an *imperfect Hoph'al* (*he is enabled* = *he can*), always used instead of the *imperfect Qal*; comp., how-

ever, § 53. *u*.—**וַתִּחַל** occurs in Jer. 3, 5 as 2nd *sing. fem.* for **וַתִּחַלִּי**, according to König, because the 2nd *fem.* was already sufficiently indicated.

- s* 4. The attenuation of *d* to *t* in the *perfect* (in a toneless, closed syllable) which is discussed in § 44. *d* (comp. § 64. *f*) occurs in verbs **פָּחַד** in a few forms of **פָּחַד** Num. 11, 12. Jer. 2, 27. Ps. 2, 7, &c. (always after *y*), as well as of **פָּחַד**, e.g. **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ**, &c., Deut. 4, 1. 8, 1. 17, 14. 19, 1. 26, 1. 31, 3 (always after *y* for *y*). In both cases the attenuation might be explained from the tendency to assimilate the vowels, especially if the initial *y* was pronounced, as in Syriac, like *i* (§ 47. *b*). In the case of **פָּחַד**, however, a secondary form **פָּחַד** (comp. § 44. *d*) is probably to be assumed, since in Arabic also the verb has the form *wāḥḍā*. The forms **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** Ezek. 36, 12 and **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** Ps. 69, 36, &c., are most simply explained from the return of this *t*.

- t* 5. As an exception, the *imperfect Niph'al* sometimes has a *y* instead of the *y*, e.g. **וַיִּתְחַל** and *he stayed*, Gen. 8, 12 (unless the *Pi'el* or **וַיִּתְחַל**, as in ver. 10, is to be read), comp. Ex. 19, 13; 1 Sam. 13, 8 *Kthhbbh*.—The first person always has the form **אֶתְחַבֵּב**, not **אֶתְחַבֵּב**, comp. § 51. *p*.—In the plural of the *participle* **נִתְחַבְּבִים** (from **נִתְחַבֵּב**, with depression of *o* to *u*, comp. § 27. *n*) is found in Zeph. 3, 18; comp. Lam. 1, 4. While in these cases some doubt may be felt as to the correctness of the Masoretic pointing, much more is this so in the *perfect* **נִתְחַבְּבִים** *null'dhā*, 1 Chron. 3, 5. 20, 8, for **נִתְחַבְּבִים** which appears to be required by the *wāw* in the initial syllable.

- u* 6. In the *imperfect Pi'el* syncope of the first radical (*y*) sometimes takes place after *wāw consec.* (as in the case of *N*, § 68. *k*), e.g. **וַיִּתְחַבֵּב** and *he has grieved*, Lam. 3, 33, **וַיִּתְחַבֵּב** for **וַיִּתְחַבֵּב** and *they have cast*, verse 53: on the other hand, in **וַיִּתְחַבֵּב** *they have cast lots*, Joel 4, 3. Ob. 11. Nah. 3, 10, a *perfect Qal* of **יָדַד** is required by the context. So from a verb **פָּחַד**, of the second class, **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** for **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** and *he made it dry*, Nah. 1, 4; comp. **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** 2 Chron. 32, 30 *Qrd* (the *Kth* points either to *Pi'el* **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ** or *Hiph'il* **וַיִּפְחַדְמוּ**).

- v* 7. In the *imperative Hiph'il* instead of the usual form **הִתְחַבֵּב**, *t* is also found in the second syllable; **הִתְחַבֵּב** Is. 43, 8; **הִתְחַבֵּב** Ps. 94, 1 (before *h*, hence probably a mere mistake for **הִתְחַבֵּב**); **הִתְחַבֵּב** Prov. 19, 25. When closed by a guttural the second syllable generally has *d*, as **הִתְחַבֵּב**, **הִתְחַבֵּב**, comp. also **הִתְחַבֵּב** Prov. 25, 17 (as in the *infinitive constr.* **הִתְחַבֵּב** Job 6, 26; see § 65. *d*). On the other hand, *t* always reappears when the syllable becomes open, thus **הִתְחַבֵּב**, **הִתְחַבֵּב**, and so also before suffixes (§ 61. *g*). **הִתְחַבֵּב** Gen. 8, 17 *Qrd* (*Kth*). **הִתְחַבֵּב** is irregular.—The *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* when the tone is drawn back take *S^{ghl}* in the second syllable, as in *Qal*, e.g. **יִתְחַבֵּב** *that he may increase*, Prov. 1, 5, before **יִתְחַבֵּב**; cf. Ex. 10, 28. Deut. 3, 26; **יִתְחַבֵּב** (Prov. 30, 6 is anomalous); in *pause*, however, also **יִתְחַבֵּב** as *jussive*, Job 40, 32 (usual *jussive* in *pause* **יִתְחַבֵּב** &c., which occurs even without the *pause* after *wāw consecutive*, Gen. 47, 11. Josh. 24, 3. 2 Sam. 8, 4, &c.). With a final guttural **יִתְחַבֵּב** and **יִתְחַבֵּב** (*jussive*) and **יִתְחַבֵּב**, &c.; with a final *ṭ* in *pause* **יִתְחַבֵּב** Ruth 2, 14: on **יִתְחַבֵּב** Is. 35, 4, comp. § 65. *f*).—On forms like **יִתְחַבֵּב**, see § 53. *g*.

In *Hoph'al* *h* stands instead of *h*, in הוֹדַע (for הוֹדַע) Lev. 4, 23, 28, הִנָּח 2 Sam. 20, 13, and perhaps in יוֹרָא (for יוֹרָה) Prov. 11, 25; but comp. Delitzsch on the passage.—An *infinitive Hoph'al* with feminine ending occurs in הוֹלֶרֶת Gen. 40, 20, for הוֹלֶרֶת = הוֹלֶר; comp. above, letter *t*, on הוֹלֶרֶת, and § 71 at the end.

8. The verb הוֹלֶרֶת *to go*, belongs in some respects to the י"ד class, for it forms (as if from הוֹלֶרֶת) *imperfect* הוֹלֶרֶת, with *wāw consecutive* הוֹלֶרֶת (in *pause* הוֹלֶרֶת Gen. 24, 61, &c.), 1st sing. הוֹלֶרֶת (but in Job 19, 17 הוֹלֶרֶת); *infinitive construct* הוֹלֶרֶת with suff. הוֹלֶרֶת, &c.; *imperative* הוֹלֶרֶת, הוֹלֶרֶת, in the lengthened form הוֹלֶרֶת (as an interjection referring even to a *feminine*, Gen. 19, 32, or a *plural*, Gen. 31, 44) and הוֹלֶרֶת (Num. 23, 13. Jud. 19, 13. 2 Chron. 25, 17, and the Mēša' inscription, line 14); *Hiph.* הוֹלֶרֶת (also in Ex. 2, 9 הוֹלֶרֶת 2nd *fem. imperative* is to be read for הוֹלֶרֶת, which probably arose merely through confusion with the following הוֹלֶרֶת; *imperfect* הוֹלֶרֶת, but in the 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* always הוֹלֶרֶת Lev. 26, 13. Amos 2, 11, &c. Rarely, and almost exclusively in the later Books or in poetry, the regular inflexions of הוֹלֶרֶת are also found: *imperf.* הוֹלֶרֶת (Ps. 58, 9, &c.; but הוֹלֶרֶת Ex. 9, 23. Ps. 73, 9; comp. § 64. *a* and *h*); הוֹלֶרֶת Job 16, 22, also Mēša' inscription, line 14, הוֹלֶרֶת; *inf.* הוֹלֶרֶת (Ex. 3, 19. Num. 22, 13 sq. 16¹. Eccles. 6, 8. 9), *imperative plur.* הוֹלֶרֶת Jer. 51, 50. On the other hand, the *perfect Qal* is always הוֹלֶרֶת, *participle* הוֹלֶרֶת, *infinitive absolute* הוֹלֶרֶת, *Niph'al* הוֹלֶרֶת, *Piel* הוֹלֶרֶת, *Hithpa'el* הוֹלֶרֶת, so that a *h* never appears unmistakably as the first radical. The usual explanation of the above forms is nevertheless based on a supposed obsolete הוֹלֶרֶת. It is, however, more correct to regard the apparent י"ד forms of הוֹלֶרֶת with Praetorius (*ZAW.* ii. 310 sqq.) as originating with the *Hiph'il*, of which the ground-form *hahlthkh* became *hālthkh*, and this again, on the analogy of the *imperfect Qal* of verbs י"ד, *hālthkh*. This *hālthkh* being referred to a supposed *hauithkh* (properly *hawithkh*) gave rise to new formations after the manner of verbs י"ד.

§ 70. Verbs י"ד. Second Class, or Verbs properly י"ד.

e.g. יָטַב *to be good.* Paradigm L.

Verbs properly י"ד differ from verbs י"ד in the following points: a

1. In *Qal* the initial *Yôdh* never suffers aphaeresis or elision; hence the *infinitive* has the form יָטַב², the *imperfect* יָטַב, יָטַב, יָטַב (in *pause* יָטַב), also written יָטַב, &c.; and so always with a tone-bearing *ā* in the second syllable, even after *wāw consec.*, e.g. יָטַב, except יָטַב Gen. 9, 24,

¹ Comp. above, letter *m*, second note.

² This may be inferred from יָטַב (= יָטַב) Is. 27, 11, which with its *fem.* יָטַב Gen. 8, 7, is the only example of an *infinitive construct Qal* of these verbs. No example of the *imperative Qal* is found: consequently יָטַב, &c. (in Paradigm L of the earlier editions of this Grammar), are only inferred from the *imperfect*.

and **וַיִּצֵר** Gen. 2, 7, 19, unless **וַיִּצֵר** is to be included among verbs **ו"ד** (comp. **וַיִּצֵר** Is. 43, 10).

- b* 2. In *Hiph'il* the original form **הִיטִיב** is regularly contracted to **הִיטִיב** (rarely written **הִטִּיב**, **הִטִּיב**, &c.); *imperfect* **יְהִיטִיב**, **וְיִהְיֶיטֵב**. Instances of the uncontracted form are **וַיִּשְׁחַד** Prov. 4, 25, according to Barth (see above, § 67. *p*), an example of an *i-imperfect* of *Qal*, since the *Hiph'il* is otherwise always *causative*; **הִשֵּׁר** (*imperative*) Ps. 5, 9 *Q're* (the *K'th.* requires **הִשֵּׁר** according to the form of verbs **ו"ד**; comp. Is. 45, 2, **וַיִּשְׁחַד** *K'th.*, **וַיִּשְׁחַד** *Q're*), comp. Gen. 8, 17 *Q're*; **וַיִּסְמְנוּ** 1 Chron. 12, 2, to be explained as a denominative from **וְסִמָּן**; **וַיִּסְרִם** Hos. 7, 12 (§ 24. *f*, note); but perhaps the punctuation here is only intended to suggest another reading **וַיִּסְרִם**.

- c* Rem. 1. The only verbs of this kind are: **וַיִּטֵּב** *to be good* (only in the *imperfect* *Qal* and in *Hiph'il*; in the *perfect* *Qal* **טָוֵב**, a verb **ו"ע**, is used instead), **וַיָּנֹכ** *to suck*, **וַיִּזְן** *to awake*, **וַיִּצֵר** *to form* (but see above, letter *a*), **וַיִּלֵּל** *Hiph'il* **וַיִּלֵּל** *to bewail*, **וַיִּשֶׁר** *to be straight, right*, also **וַיִּשֶׁשׁ** (Arabic *ydbšš*) *to be dry* (but *Hiph'il* **וַיִּשֶׁשׁ** 2 Sam. 19, 6, on the analogy of verbs **ו"ד**; on Is. 30, 5, comp. § 72. *x*), and the *Hiph'il* **וַיִּמְיֵן** (denominative from **וְיָמֵן**) *to go to the right*.

- d* 2. In some examples of the *imperfect* *Hiph'il* the preformative has been subsequently added to the contracted form: **וַיִּטֵּב** Job 24, 21; **וַיִּלֵּל** Is. 15, 2, 3, 16, 7; **וַיִּלֵּל** Jer. 48, 31; plur. **וַיִּלְלוּ** Hos. 7, 14, comp. Is. 65, 14. Qimhi and others explain the above forms from a phonetic interchange of *Yôdh* and *He*, arising from the unsyncopated forms **וְיִהְיֶיטֵב**, &c. (comp. Is. 52, 5). It would, perhaps, be more correct to suppose that the regular forms (**וַיִּטֵּב**, **וַיִּלֵּל**) were originally intended, but that in the later pronunciation the syllable was broken up in order to restore artificially the preformative which had become merged in the first radical.

- e* Isolated anomalies are: *perfect* *Hiph'il* **וַיִּטְבְּחִי** Ezek. 36, 11 with separating vowel (for **וְיִטְבְּחִי**) on the analogy of verbs **ו"ע**; *imperfect* **וַיִּטְבֵּי** for **וַיִּטֵּב** 1 Ki. 1, 47; **וַיִּטְבֵּי** (*imperfect* *Qal* for **וְיִטְבֵּי**) Nah. 3, 8; **וַיִּטְבֵּי** *imperfect* *Hiph'il*, Ex. 2, 9, either an error for **וְיִטְבֵּי**, or an irregular shortening of the first syllable, caused by the forward movement of the tone. Similarly, the *Hiph'il* **וַיִּמְיֵן** (from **וְיָמֵן**) is always used for **וַיִּמְיֵן** from **וְיָמֵן**. On **וַיִּבְשְׁחוּ** Nah. 1, 4, see § 69. *u*.

§ 71. Verbs **ו"ד**. Third Class, or Verbs with *Yôdh* assimilated.

In some verbs **ו"ד**, the *Yôdh* (or the original *Wāw*) does not quiesce in the preceding vowel, but is regarded as a full consonant, and, like *Nûn*¹, is assimilated to the following consonant. These forms,

¹ These verbs, like verbs **ו"ע** (cf. above, note on § 67. *g*), may perhaps have been influenced by the analogy of verbs **ו"ד**.

therefore, belong properly to the class of strong verbs. Assimilation invariably takes place in **נָצַע** (prop. **נָצַע**) *to spread under*; *Hiph'il* **הִנָּצַע**, *Hoph'al* **הִנָּצַע**; **נָצַח** *to burn*, imperfect **יִנָּח**, *Niph'al* **נִנָּח**, *Hiph'il* **הִנָּח** (in Is. 27, 4 also **נָצַח** is to be read with König; in 2 Sam. 14, 30 the Masora has rightly emended the *Kithbāh* **וְהִנָּחֵהוּ**, which could only be the 1st sing. perf. of a verb **נָצַח**, to the imperative **וְהִנָּחֵהוּ** in agreement with the context and all the early versions); **נָצַח**, *Hiph'il* **הִנָּח** *to place*, *Hoph'il* **הִנָּח**; and probably also in the forms ordinarily derived from **נָצַח**, viz. **נָצַח** (*Niph'al*), **נָצַח**, **נָצַח**; at any rate a stem **נָצַח** is implied by the *Hithpa'el* **וְהִתְנָחֵם**; instead of the anomalous **וְהִתְנָחֵם** Ex. 2, 4 read with the Samaritan **וְהִתְנָחֵם**, i. e. **וְהִתְנָחֵם**. Besides the common form we find once **נָצַח** in Is. 44, 3 (from **נָצַח** *to pour*) with a *transitive* meaning, beside **נָצַח** *intransitive*, 1 Ki. 22, 35. Elsewhere the *imperfect consecutive* has the form **וְנָצַח** Gen. 28, 18. 35, 14. &c., comp. § 69. f, where also other forms of **נָצַח** are given; **נָצַח** and **נָצַח** (Is. 44, 12. 49, 8. Jer. 1, 5 *Qrā*), from **נָצַח** *to form*, are, however, used in the same sense. Comp. also **נָצַח** Hos. 10, 10; **נָצַח** (for **נָצַח** according to § 47. k) 1 Sam. 6, 12; 2 Chron. 31, 7 (comp. § 69. n) and **נָצַח** Is. 28, 16. This assimilation is found only with sibilants (most frequently with **נ**) except in the case of **נָצַח** 1 Ki. 3, 15 (where, however, others read **נָצַח**) and in **נָצַח** Gen. 40, 20. Ezek. 16, 5 (comp. **נָצַח** verse 4), *infinitive Hoph'al* of **נָצַח** (comp. **נָצַח** § 69. l).

§ 72. Verbs ו'ע (vulgo ו'ע), e. g. **קָם** *to rise up*. Paradigm M.

1. According to § 67. a a large number of monosyllabic stems were brought into agreement with the triliteral form by a strengthening, or repetition, of the second radical, i. e. of the *consonantal* element in the stem. In another large class of stems the same object has been attained by strengthening the *vocalic* element. The ground-form used for these verbs is not, as in other cases (§ 39. a), the 3rd sing. masc. perfect, but always the *infinitive construct* form (§ 39. b), the *ā* of which is characteristic also of the *imperative* and of the *imperfect indicative Qal*. These stems are consequently termed verbs ו'ע or more correctly (see Rem.) ו'ע¹.

¹ The term ו'ע was consequent on the view (formerly accepted in this Grammar) that the *Wāw* (or *ʾ* in the case of verbs ו'ע) in these stems was originally

- b* 2. As in the case of verbs $y'y$, the monosyllabic stem of verbs $y'y$ generally retains the vowel which would have been required in the *second* syllable of the ordinary strong form, since this belongs essentially to the character of the verbal form (§ 43. *b*; § 67. *b*). However, it is to be remarked: (*a*) that the vowel, short in itself, becomes of necessity long in an open syllable as well as in a tone-bearing closed *ultima* (except in *Hoph'al*, see letter *d*), e.g. 3rd *sing. masc. perf.* מָדָה, *fem.* מָדְהָ, *plur.* מָדְהוּ, but in a closed *penultima* מָדְהָ, &c.¹; (*b*) that in the forms as we now have them the lengthening of the original short vowel sometimes takes place irregularly. Comp. letter *f*.
- c* Intransitive verbs middle E in the *perfect Qal* have the form מָת *he is dead*; verbs middle O have the form מָת *luxit*, מָת *he was ashamed*². Comp. letters *n* to *r*.

consonantal. This view seemed especially to be supported by the return of the *Wāw* in *Pi'el* (מָדָה, the *l* usually passing into *'* as in מָדָה, cf. Arabic *qāwḥmā*), and by certain forms of the *absolute state* of the nouns of such stems, e.g. מָת *death*, compared with מָת *to die*. Hence in explaining the verbal forms a supposed stem *qawam* (in verbs $y'y$ e.g. *layat*) was always assumed, and מָדָה was referred to an original *yaqwām*, the *infinitive absolute* מָדָה to original *qāwām*, the *participle passive* מָדָה to original *qāwām*. It must, however, be admitted: (1) that forms like מָדָה, מָדָה (letter *m*) are only to be found in the latest Books, and are hence evidently secondary as compared with the pure Hebrew forms מָדָה, &c.; (2) that to refer the verbal forms invariably to the stem מָדָה, leads in many cases to phonetic combinations which are essentially improbable, whereas the assumption of original *middle-vowel* stems renders a simple and natural explanation almost always possible. These $y'y$ stems are therefore to be rigidly distinguished from the real $y'y$ stems of the strong form, such as מָדָה, מָדָה, &c. (see below, letter *gg*). As early as the eleventh century the right view with regard to $y'y$ stems was taken by Samuel Hannagid (cf. Bacher, *Leben und Werke des Abulwalid*, p. 16), recently by Böttcher (*Lehrbuch*, § 1112), and especially by Müller and Stade (see above, p. 182, note) with regard both to $y'y$ and $y'y$ verbs.

¹ In Aramaic, however, always מָדָה; also in Hebrew Grammars before Qimhi מָדָה, מָדָה, &c. are found, but in our editions of the Bible this occurs only in *pause*, e.g. מָדָה Mic. 7, 8, מָדָה 2 Ki. 7, 3. 4.

² According to Stade (*Grammatik*, § 385. *e* and *f*) the *e* in מָת is of the nature of a diphthong (from *ai*, which arose from the union of the vowel *i*, the sign of the intransitive, with the *a* of the root), and likewise the *o* in מָת, &c. (from *au*). But *o* (from *au*) could not, by § 26. *p*, remain in a closed penultima (מָת, &c.); consequently the *o* of these forms can only be tone-long, i.e. due to lengthening of an original *a*, and similarly the *e* of מָת to lengthening of an original *i*. This is confirmed by the fact that the *o* in מָת, מָת, מָת is always, and in מָת,

3. In the *imperfect Qal*, *perfect Niph'al* and throughout *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al* the short vowel of the preformatives in an open syllable before the tone is changed into the corresponding tone-long vowel. In *Qal* and *Niph'al* the original *ä* is the basis of the form and not the *i* attenuated from *ä* (§ 67. *h*; but cf. also below, letter *h* on יב'ט), hence יָקַם for *yäqûm*; נָקַם for *näqûm*; on the other hand, in the *perfect Hiph'il* הִקַּם for *hîqûm*; *participle* מְקַם (on the *Sere* cf. letter *s*); *perfect Hoph'al* הֻקַּם for *hûqam*.

A vowel thus lengthened before the tone is naturally changeable and becomes *vocal Šwâ* when the tone is moved forward, e.g. יִמְרֹנֶה he will kill him; so also in the 3rd *plur. imperfect Qal* with *Nûn paragogic*; יִמְרֹנֶה (without *Nûn* יִמְרֹנֶה). The wholly abnormal *scriptio plena* of *ē* in הִיָּמִיר Jer. 2, 11 (beside הִמִּיר in the same verse) should, with König, be emended into הִיָּמִיר; the incorrect repetition of the interrogative, however, necessarily led to the form being pointed as *perfect* instead of *imperfect*.—Only in *Hoph'al* is the *ä* retained throughout as an unchangeable vowel, when it has been introduced by an abnormal lengthening for the tone-long *ē* (as in the *Hoph'al* of verbs ו'ע).

4. The cases of unusual vowel lengthening mentioned in letter *b* are: *f* *imperfect Qal* יָקַם (also in Arabic *yäqûmu*), but *jussive* with normal lengthening (§ 48. *g*), יָקַם, with retraction of the tone יָקַם (*yäqûm*), יָקַם (in *pause* יָקַם); *imperative* יָקַם; the normal lengthening of the *ä* occurs in the 2nd *plur. fem.* יָקַם, since, according to § 26. *p*, *ä* cannot be retained in a closed penultima; *infinitive construct* יָקַם. In *Hiph'il* the lengthening of the original *i* to *i* (הִקַּם, *imperfect* יָקַם, *jussive* יָקַם, with retraction of the tone יָקַם, יָקַם) exactly agrees with the analogy of the strong verb (comp. § 53. *a*).

The following forms require special consideration: the *participle g* *Qal* מְקַם is to be traced to the ground-form with *ä* unobscured, Arab. *qadîl*, § 9. *q*, and § 50. *b*. The analogous form *qadîm*¹, after absorption of the *i*, became מְקַם, owing to the predominating character of the *ä*. The unchangeableness of the *ä* (*plur.* מְקַם, *constr.* מְקַם, &c.) favours this explanation.

3rd *plur. perfect*, nearly always (the instances are 11 to 2) written defectively. Forms like מְקַם, מְקַם, מְקַם, &c. are therefore to be treated as orthographic licences.

¹ So in Arabic (prop. *qadîm*, since the two vowels are kept apart by the insertion of an *m*, comp. Aram. מְקַם); but also contracted, as *šāh*, *hār*, for *šā'ih*, &c. (comp. Wright's *Gramm. of the Arabic Language*, 2nd ed. vol. i. p. 164).

h In the *imperfect Qal*, besides the forms with original *ā* (now *a*) there are also forms with original *ā*. This *ā* was lengthened to *ā*, and then further obscured to *o*; hence especially יָבֹא (יָבֵא), &c., from the *perfect* בָּא *he has come*. In the *imperfects* יֵאָדָר and יֵבֹשֶׁת from the *intransitive perfects* אָדָר, בָּשָׂה (see above, letter *c*), most probably also in יֵאָדָר 2 Ki. 12, 9, יֵאָדָר Gen. 34, 15 from an unused אָדָר *to consent*, and perhaps in יֵהָדָם 1 Sam. 4, 5, &c., as in the cases noticed in § 63. *e* and especially § 67. *n*, the *e* of the preformative is lengthened from *i* (which is attenuated from the original *ā*) and thus *yī-bāš* became *yī-bāš*, and finally *yē-bāš*. Finally the *Niph.* נִקָּם (*nā-qām*), *imperfect* יִקָּם from *y-hinqām* (§ 51. *a*) = *yiqqām*, arises in the same way from the obscuring of *ā* lengthened from *ā*.

i 5. In the *perfect Niph'al* and *Hiph'il* a *i* is inserted before the affirmatives beginning with a consonant in the 1st and 2nd persons and יָ regularly in the *imperfect Qal*, sometimes also in the *imperfect Hiph'il*, before the termination נָה (see, however, the Rem.). As in verbs *ע"ע* (§ 67. *d*) these *separating vowels* serve as an artificial opening of the preceding syllable, in order that it may retain its long vowel; in the *perfect Hiph'il*, however, before the *i*, instead of the *f* an *e* is somewhat frequently found¹ (as a normal lengthening of the original *i*), especially after *wāw consecutive*, Deut. 4, 39. 30, 1, as well as before the affirmatives נָה and נָה or before suffixes, Deut. 22, 2. 1 Sam. 6, 8. 1 Ki. 8, 34. Ezek. 34, 4. For in all these cases the tone is removed from the *i* to the following syllable, and this forward movement of the tone produces at the same time a weakening of the *f* to *e*; thus הִקָּם, הִקָּמָה (or 'הִקָּם), but הִקָּמָה, &c., Ex. 26, 30, &c.; Deut. 4, 39. Num. 18, 26 (comp., however, הִקָּמָה Mic. 5, 4). In the same way in the 1st pers. sing. of the *perfect Niph'al* the *o* before the separating vowel is always modified to *a* (יֵאָדָר); comp. letter *v*. In the *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph'il* the separating vowel יָ always bears the tone (יֵאָדָר).

k Without the separating vowel and consequently with the tone-long *o* and *e* instead of *a* and *f* we find in *imperfect Qal* יֵבֹאנָה (see § 76. *g*); יֵשָׁבֵן Ezek. 16, 55 (also יֵשָׁבֵן in the same verse); יֵשָׁבֵן 1 Sam. 7, 14 (comp. Ezek. 35, 9 *Q^{re}*);

¹ וְהִקָּמָה 1 Sam. 6, 7 (comp. 2 Chron. 6, 25) could only be an orthographic licence for וְהִקָּמָה; perhaps, however, וְהִקָּמָה was originally intended.

on the *K^uthbā* תִּשְׁבְּנָה comp. above, note on § 69. *b*); תִּשְׁבְּנָה 1 Sam. 14, 27 from אָז (K^uthbā תִּשְׁבְּנָה they saw, see § 75. *w*); in *Hiph'il*, e.g. תִּנְחַם Ex. 20, 25, also תִּנְחַם Job 31, 21; תִּנְחַם Jer. 22, 26; תִּשְׁבְּנָה Job 20, 10; with a separating vowel, e.g. תִּשְׁבְּנָה Lev. 7, 30 from אָז. *Sghol* without *y* occurs in the *imperfect Qal* in תִּשְׁבְּנָה Ezek. 13, 19. Zech. 1, 17; and in *Hiph'il* Mic. 2, 12: the Dages in the *Nāw* is, with Baer, to be rejected in all three cases according to the best authorities. Wholly abnormal is תִּשְׁבְּנָה Jer. 44, 25, probably an erroneous transposition of ים (for תִּשְׁבְּנָה), unless it originates from an incorrect spelling תִּשְׁבְּנָה or תִּשְׁבְּנָה.

6. The tone as in verbs ו'ע (comp. § 67. *k*) is also retained in verbs ו'ע before the affirmatives הַ, י, '—, generally on the stem-syllable; thus קָמָה (but also קָמָה 2 Ki. 19, 21, probably for the sake of rhythmical uniformity with the following לָקַעַה; after *wāw consecutive* תִּשְׁבְּנָה Is. 23, 17); קָמָה (but also קָמָה, comp. Is. 28, 7. 29, 9. Nah. 3, 18. Ps. 76, 6. Lam. 4, 18; וְקָמָה 1 Sam. 8, 11; so especially before a following א, cf. § 49. *l*, Num. 13, 32; וְקָמָה Is. 19, 1; before ו, Lam. 4, 14); תִּשְׁבְּנָה, but before a *suffix* or with *Nāw paragogic* וְיִסְכְּרוּ 2 Chron. 28, 15; וְיִסְכְּרוּ Deut. 33, 11, &c.

7. The formation of the conjugations *Pi'el*, *Pu'al* and *Hithpa'el* is, *m* strictly speaking, excluded by the nature of verbs ו'ע. It is only in the latest Books that we find a few secondary formations, probably.. borrowed from Aramaic, on the analogy of verbs ו'ע (with consonantal *y*, see below, letter *gg*); e.g. the *Pi'el* עָוֵר to surround, Ps. 119, 61, and with change of *y* to *y*, קָיַם, *infinitive* קָיַם Esth. 9, 31. 32, &c., from קָיַם; וְיִבְרָחָם Dan. 1, 10 from וְיִבְרָחָם to be guilty. The *Hithpa'el* הִתְעַמֵּיר Josh. 9, 12, which belongs to the older language, is probably a denominative from עָמֵר. On the other hand the otherwise less common conjugation *Pi'el* (properly *Pa'lil*, see § 55. *d*), with its passive and reflexive, is usually employed in the sense of *Pi'el* and as a substitute for it, e.g. קָיַם from *qāmēm* with obscuring of *ā* to *ō* (comp. § 55. *b*) to set up from קָיַם; מוֹתֵחַ to slaughter, 1 Sam. 14, 13. 17, 51. 2 Sam. 1, 9, from מוֹתֵחַ; רוֹמֵם to exalt, passive רוֹמֵם from רוֹמֵם; reflexive הִתְעַמֵּיר to stir up oneself (comp. יִתְעַקֵּר Job 17, 8 in pause) from עָר; reciprocal הִתְבַּשְּׁשׁ to be ashamed before one another, Gen. 2, 25. The conjugation *Pilp'el* (§ 55. *f*) is less common, e.g. מְלִטֵּל to hurl away from מוֹל; מְלִטֵּל to destroy from מוֹל.

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

1. Of verbs *middle E* and *O*, in which, as in the strong verb, the *perfect* and *participle* have the same form (§ 50. 2) the following are the only examples: מָוֹת *he is dead, fem.* מָוֹתוֹ, 2nd *masc.* מָוֹתוֹ (comp. § 44. g; § 66. h); 1st *sing.* מָוֹתִי, (even in *pause*, Gen. 19, 19); *plur.* מָוֹתֵי, 1st *pers.* מָוֹתֵנִי, in *pause* מָוֹתֵנִי; נָדָה *it fleeth away*, Is. 17, 11; בָּשָׁם *he was ashamed*, בָּשָׁמִי, בָּשָׁמְךָ; בָּשָׁם, בָּשָׁמִי, בָּשָׁמְךָ; אֹרֵר *it has shone, plur.* אֹרְרֵי; מָוֹב *to be good*, מָוֹבֵי. *Participles* מָוֹת *a dead man* (*plur.* מָוֹתִים, מָוֹתֵי); מָוֹשִׁים *ashamed*, Ezek. 32, 30.

0 Isolated anomalies in the perfect are: וְשָׁכַחְתָּ (with the original ending of the *fem.* for וְשָׁכַחְתָּ) Ezek. 46, 17 (see § 44. f); וְצָקִין Is. 26, 16 (*Nûn* *paragogic* with the *perfect* elsewhere only in Deut. 8, 3. 16).—In וְנָנִי 1 Sam. 25, 8 (for וְנָנִי from וְנָנִי) the *N* has been dropped contrary to custom. In וְנָנִי Jer. 27, 18 (instead of וְנָנִי) the *Masora* seems to point to the *imperfect* וְנָנִי which is what would be expected; as *Yâdh* precedes, it is perhaps simply a scribal error.

p The form וְנָנִי occurs (cf. § 9. b) with *N* in the *perfect*, וְנָנִי Hos. 10, 14, also in the *participles* וְנָנִי *softly*, Jud. 4, 21, וְנָנִי *poor*, 2 Sam. 12, 1. 4. Prov. 10, 4, *plur.* 13, 23; וְנָנִי *doing despite unto*, Ezek. 28, 24. 26; *fem.* 16, 57; also in Zech. 14, 10 וְנָנִי is to be read with Ben-Naphtali for וְנָנִי. On the analogy of participles of verbs *middle O* (like וְנָנִי, see above) וְנָנִי occurs for וְנָנִי 2 Ki. 16, 7 and even with a transitive meaning וְנָנִי *occultans*, Is. 25, 7; וְנָנִי Zech. 10, 5. *Participle passive*, וְנָנִי *circumcised*; but וְנָנִי *a backslider*, Prov. 14, 14, and וְנָנִי *put aside*, Is. 49, 21 (cf. Jer. 17, 13 *Qrd*), are verbal adjectives of the form qātûl (§ 50. f), not passive participles. For וְנָנִי *hastening*, Num. 32, 17, read וְנָנִי as in Ex. 13, 18.

q 2. With *imperfects* in *Q* there are almost always the corresponding *imperative* and *infinitive construct* in *Q*, as וְנָנִי, *imperative* and *infinitive* וְנָנִי (also defectively written וְנָנִי, וְנָנִי); but with וְנָנִי *he threshes* (*inf.* וְנָנִי) the *imperative* וְנָנִי (*fem.*) occurs in Mic. 4, 13; with וְנָנִי *it slippeth*, the *infinitive* וְנָנִי (Ps. 38, 17. 46, 3); comp. וְנָנִי (also וְנָנִי) Num. 11, 25 and וְנָנִי Is. 7, 2 (elsewhere וְנָנִי) with the *imperfects* וְנָנִי and וְנָנִי; וְנָנִי Is. 30, 2; וְנָנִי Josh. 2, 16; וְנָנִי Ezek. 10, 17 (vers. 16 וְנָנִי).

r Where the *imperfect* has *Q* the *imperative* and *infinitive* also have it; thus *imperfect* וְנָנִי (*Qrd*), *infinitive*, &c., וְנָנִי 2 Sam. 2, 32, וְנָנִי, וְנָנִי; וְנָנִי, &c.—וְנָנִי Job 8, 14 (if it be a verb at all and not rather a substantive) is formed on the analogy of verbs וְנָנִי, since the *imperfect* of וְנָנִי appears as וְנָנִי in Ps. 95, 10. On the other hand וְנָנִי (as if from וְנָנִי) occurs as *imperfect* of וְנָנִי (*Qrd*), on the analogy of וְנָנִי, &c. The *imperfect* וְנָנִי, with *Q*, Gen. 6, 3 probably in the sense of *to rule, to govern* has no corresponding *perfect*, and is

¹ In 1 Ki. 14, 12 (וְנָנִי before a genitive), the text is evidently corrupt: read with Klostermann after the LXX וְנָנִי.

perhaps intentionally differentiated from the common verb *יָדִין* to judge (from *יָדַן*, ע"י). Or can *יָדִין* be a *jussive* after *לֹא* (cf. § 109. d)? Similarly *לֹא תַחֲסֹם עֵינֶי* (ע"י; ע"י) might be taken as a case of a *jussive* after *לֹא*, with irregular *scriptio plena* (as in Jud. 16, 30), in Deut. 7, 16. 13, 9. 19, 13. 21. 25, 12. Ezek. 5, 11. 7, 4. 9. 8, 18. 9, 10. But perhaps in all these cases *לֹא תַחֲסֹם* was originally intended, as in Is. 13, 18. Jer. 21, 7. The *infinitive absolute* always has *θ*, e.g. *יָקֻמוּ קוֹם* Jer. 44, 29.

3. In the *imperative* with affirmatives (*קָמֵה*, *קָמֵי*) the tone is on the stem *5* syllable; comp., however, *עָמָרִי* Jud. 5, 12 intentionally varied from *עָמָרִי*; also *עָמָרִי* Zech. 13, 7 and Is. 51, 9 beside *עָמָרִי*; *עָמָרִי* Zech. 9, 9; *עָמָרִי* Is. 21, 2, *עָמָרִי* Ps. 116, 7 likewise for rhythmical reasons. So also the lengthened form, as *עָמָרִי* Jer. 3, 12 Ps. 7, 8, and *עָמָרִי* verse 7. But if an *א*, *ה* or *ע* follows in close connexion, the lengthened *imperative* usually has the form *קָמָה*, &c.¹, in order to avoid a hiatus, e.g. Jud. 4, 18. Ps. 82, 8; hence also before *יְהִי*, *Q'rd perpetuum* *אֲרִי* (§ 17), e.g. Ps. 3, 8. 7, 7 *קָמָה* (comp., however, in the same verse *עָמָרִי* before *א*; *קָמָה* Ps. 44, 27, and *רָמָה* Ps. 57, 6. 12, before *ע*; *שָׁמָה* before *א* Jer. 40, 5, and before *ה* 2 Sam. 15, 27¹, and even before *ר* Ps. 43, 1. 74, 22 and elsewhere (*רָמָה*)).

4. In the *jussive*, besides the form *יָקָם* (see above, letter *f*), *יָקֻם* also occurs ² (as subjunctive, Eccles. 12, 4; *נָסֹחַ* Ps. 80, 19 may also, with Delitzsch, be regarded as a voluntative), incorrectly written *plene*, and *יָקָם* (Gen. 27, 31; comp. Jud. 6, 18. Prov. 9, 4. 16), which, however, is only orthographically different from *יָקָם* (comp. Is. 46, 6). In the *imperfect consecutive* (*יָקָם*, in *pause* *יָקָם*, see above, letter *f*) if there be a guttural or *ר* in the last syllable, *θ* often takes the place of *δ*, e.g. *וַיָּנַח* and he rested; *וַיָּנַע* and it was moved; *וַיָּסַר* and he turned aside, Jud. 4, 18. Ruth 4, 1 (different only in meaning from *Hiph'il* *וַיָּסַר* and he removed, Gen. 8, 13); *וַיָּצַר* 2 Ki. 5, 23. 17, 5 (but also *וַיָּנַר* both from *נָרַר* to sojourn, and *נָרַר* to fear); *וַיָּעַף* (to be distinguished from *וַיָּעַף* and he flew, Is. 6, 6) and he was weary, Jud. 4, 21. 1 Sam. 14, 28. 31. 2 Sam. 21, 15, but probably in all these cases *וַיָּעַף* for *וַיָּעַף* from *עָף* is intended. On the other hand, in an open syllable always *וַיָּקָמוּ*, *וַיָּסֻרוּ*, &c. On *וַיָּקָמוּ* (*וַיָּקָמוּ*), see § 49. e.

Examples of the full plural ending *וּן* with the tone (see above, letter *l*) are ²⁴ *וַיָּחֲמֻן* Gen. 3, 3. 4; *וַיָּטֹמֻן* Ps. 104, 7; *וַיָּרֻצֻן* Joel 2, 4. 7. 9.

II. On Niph'al.

5. The form of the 1st *sing. perf.* *נִקְמָוֹתִי*, which frequently occurs (*נִסְמָוֹתִי*, *נִסְמָוֹתִי*), serves as a model for the 2nd *sing. perf.* *נִקְמָוֹתִי*, and the 1st *plur.* *נִקְמָוֹתֵנוּ* given in the paradigm, although no instances of these forms are found;

¹ Comp. Delitzsch's *Commentary* on Ps. 3, 8.

but of the 2nd *plur.* the only examples found have *θ* (not *δ*), viz. נִפְּצֹתֶם *ye have been scattered*, Ezek. 11, 17, 20, 34, 41, and נִקְטָתֶם *and ye shall loathe yourselves*, Ezek. 20, 43, 36, 31.—To the *ī* (instead of *ê*) of the preformative may be traced the *perfect* נָעוּר Zech. 2, 17 (analogous to the *perfect* and *participle* נָפַל, see below, letter *ee*), *imperfect* יַעוּר for *yi''ôr*.—The *infinitive construct* הִדָּשׁ occurs in Is. 25, 10; in לֵאמֹר Job 33, 30, the Masora assumes the syncope of the ה (for לִהְיוֹר); but probably לֵאמֹר (*Qal*) is intended (see § 51. *l*).—נִמְּוֹג Is. 14, 31, נִמְּוֹג Is. 59, 13 are to be regarded as *infinitives absolute*.

III. On *Hiph'îl*, *Hoph'al*, and *Pi'îl*.

- w* 6. Examples of the *perfect* without a separating vowel (see above, letter *k*) are: הִכְבִּיתָ, &c. (see further, § 76. *g*); הִסְתַּח (from סִחַת) for *hêmdeh-tâ* (comp. § 20. *a*, and such cases as הִסְתַּח 3rd *fem.* *perfect* *Hiph'îl* from סִחַת or סִיחַ 1 Ki. 21, 25; הִכְנִי 1st *plur.* *perfect* *Hiph'îl* from כָּנַן 2 Chron. 29, 19), even הִסְתַּח (§ 27. *s*) Num. 17, 6, and elsewhere; cf. 2 Sam. 13, 28, also הִסְתַּח Ex. 1, 16, and הִסְתַּח Hos. 2, 5; but elsewhere, with *wāw* consecutive הִסְתַּח Is. 14, 30; comp. הִסְתַּח Is. 16, 13, and הִסְתַּח Ex. 29, 24, and elsewhere.—In these cases the *ē* of the first syllable is retained in the secondary tone; elsewhere in the second syllable before the tone it becomes $\overline{\text{—}}$ (1 Chron. 15, 12, &c.) or more frequently $\overline{\text{—}}$, and in the syllable before the antepenultima it is necessarily $\overline{\text{—}}$ (e.g. הִקְטַח Gen. 6, 18). Before a suffix in the 3rd *sing. masc.* (except Gen. 40, 13) and *fem.*, and in the 3rd *plur.*, the vowel of the initial syllable is *Hateph-Seghōl*, in the other persons always *Hateph-Pathah* (König); on הִקְטַח 2 Ki. 9, 2. Ps. 89, 44, comp. Ex. 19, 23. Num. 31, 28. Deut. 4, 39. 22, 2. 30, 1. Ezek. 34, 4, and above, letter *i*.
- x* As in verbs ע'ע' with פ' for their first radical (§ 67. *w*) all the forms of עוּר Ex. 19, 23, &c., and עוּר Is. 41, 25. 45, 13, take *Pathah* in these conjugations instead of $\overline{\text{—}}$. The irregular הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ Zech. 10, 6 has evidently arisen from a combination of two different readings, viz. הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ (from הִשָּׁב) and הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ (from הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ): the latter is to be preferred.—On הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ and הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ as a (metaplastic) *perfect Hiph'îl* of הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ, cf. § 78.
- y* 7. In the *imperative*, besides the short form הִשָּׁב (on הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ Is. 44, 22 with Silluq, comp. § 29. *q*; but in Ezek. 21, 35 for הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ the *infinitive* הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ is to be read) the lengthened form הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ is also found. With suffix הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ, &c. The *imperative* הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ Jer. 17, 18 is irregular (for הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ Gen. 43, 16); perhaps הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ (as in 1 Sam. 20, 40; comp. 2 Ki. 8, 6) is intended, or it was originally הוֹשִׁיעָהוּ.
- z* In the *infinitive* syncope of the ה occurs in לִבִּי Jer. 39, 7. 2 Chron. 31, 10 (for לִבִּי); הִֿ *fem.* is added in לִבִּי Is. 30, 28; comp. Esth. 2, 18 and the analogous *infinitive Haph'el* in Biblical Aramaic, Dan. 5, 20.—As *infinitive absolute* הִֿ occurs in Ezek. 7, 14 (perh. also Jos. 4, 3. Jer. 10, 23).—The *participles* have *ē* as the vowel of the preformative, like verbs ע'ע'. On מְבִי 2 Sam. 5, 2, &c. (in *Kethibh*), see § 74. *h*.
- aa* On the shortened forms of the *imperfect* יָקַם, יָקַם, but always יָקַם (see above, letter *f*). If the final radical be a guttural or ר the last syllable generally has

Pathah (as in *Qal*), e.g. יָרַח *he smells*, 1 Sam. 26, 19; וָרַח Gen. 8, 21; וָרַח *and he took away*, Gen. 8, 13. The 1st sing. of the *imperfect consecutive* commonly has the form וְיִשָּׁב Neh. 2, 20, less frequently the form וְיִשָּׁב Jos. 14, 7; וְיִשָּׁב 1 Ki. 2, 42 and elsewhere. For אָסַף Zeph. 1, 2 (after אָסַף) and in verse 3, read אָסַף from אָסַף, on the analogy of אָסַף § 68. *g*: similarly in Jer. 8, 13 אָסַף instead of אָסַף.

In the *imperfect Pi'il* the tone is moved backwards before a following tone-syllable, but without a shortening of the vowel of the final syllable; e.g. וְיִשָּׁב Prov. 14, 34; וְיִשָּׁב Job 35, 14; comp. also וְיִשָּׁב Job 30, 20; always in principal pause; on the *Metheg* with *Šere*, comp. § 16. *f*, *γ*.—As *participle Hoph'al* הוֹפֵל occurs in close connexion, Gen. 43, 12; comp. § 65. *d*.

Peculiar contracted forms of *Pi'il* (unless they are transitives in *Qal*) are *cc* וְיִשָּׁב Job 31, 15, וְיִשָּׁב 41, 2, וְיִשָּׁב Is. 64, 6 for וְיִשָּׁב, &c.; also וְיִשָּׁב Job 17, 4 for וְיִשָּׁב.—In Is. 15, 5 יַעֲרֹר appears to have arisen from the *Pilpel* וְיַעֲרֹר, the *d* after the loss of the *ר* having been lengthened to *ā*, which has then been changed into the obscure *ō*.—The strange form בְּחִקְוֹתֶיךָ Ps. 139, 21 cannot (according to § 52. *s*) be explained as a *participle* with the *ט* omitted, but must be emended to בְּחִקְוֹתֶיךָ.

IV. In General.

8. The verbs ע"ע are primarily related to the verbs ע"ע (§ 67), which *dd* were also originally *bilateral*, so that it is especially necessary in analyzing them to pay attention to the differences between the inflexion of the two classes. Several forms are exactly the same in both, e.g. *imperfect Qal* and *Hiph'il* with *wāw consecutive*, the whole of *Hoph'al*, the *Pi'il* of verbs ע"ע, and the *Pō'il* of verbs ע"ע; see § 67. *z*. Owing to this close relation, verbs ע"ע sometimes have forms which follow the analogy of verbs ע"ע, e.g. *perfect Qal* בָּזַח *he has despised* (from בָּזַח, as if from בָּזַח) Zech. 4, 10, בָּזַח (for בָּזַח) *he hath daubed*, Is. 44, 18; *perfect Niph'al* נָבַר Jer. 48, 11 (for נָבַר from נָבַר, as if from נָבַר). The same explanation equally applies to נָקַח Job 10, 1 for נָקַח (comp. § 67. *dd*) = נָקַח from נָקַח, and נָקַח Ezek. 6, 9 (for נָקַח); נָקַח Ezek. 10, 17 and נָקַח verse 15; הִרְפּוּ (*imperative*) Num. 17, 10; יָפַן Mic. 2, 6; *Hiph'il perfect* הִתַּן Is. 18, 5 for הִתַּן (comp. § 29. *q*), which is for הִתַּן from הִתַּן. On the other hand the *imperfects* יָמַר Ezek. 48, 14 (unless it be intended for יָמַר, comp. Ps. 15, 4) and יָפַח Hab. 2, 3 are to be regarded according to § 109. *i*, simply as rhythmically shortened forms of יָמַר and יָפַח.

9. In common with verbs ע"ע (§ 67. *g*) verbs ע"ע sometimes have in *Niph'al* *ee* and *Hiph'al* the quasi-Aramaic formation, by which, instead of the long vowel under the preformative, they take a short vowel with *Dageš forte* in the following consonant; this variety is frequently found even along with the ordinary form, e.g. הִפִּית *to incite*, imperfect יָפִית (also הִפִּית, יָפִית); הִפִּיג, imperfect יָפִיג *to remove* (from סָגַן), also *Hoph'al* הִפִּיג Is. 59, 14 (on הִפִּיג comp. § 29. *g*); sometimes with a difference of meaning, as הִנִּיחַ *to cause to rest*¹, but הִנִּיחַ

¹ As the passive of this *Hiph'il* we should expect the *Hoph'al* הִנִּיחַ, which is, no doubt, to be read for הִנִּיחַ in Lam. 5, 5.

(*imperfect* **יָנַח**, *consecutive* **יָנַח** Gen. 39, 16; *imperative* **הִנָּח**, plur. **הִנָּחוּ**) to set down; for **וְהִנָּחָה** (Baer, Ginsburg **וְהִנָּח**) Zech. 5, 11 (which at any rate could only be explained as an isolated passive of *Hiph'il* on the analogy of the Biblical Aramaic **הִקְיִמַת** Dan. 7, 4) we should probably read **וְהִנָּחָה** with Klostermann and the LXX; in Dan. 8, 11 the *K^athibh* **הִרִים** is intended for a *perfect Hiph'il*. The same distinction in meaning is also noticeable between **יָלִין** to spend the night, to remain, but **יָלִין** Ex. 16, 7 *Q^are* (*K^athibh* **יָלִינוּ**); on the contrary, verse 2 *K^athibh* **יָלִינוּ**, *Q^are* **יָלִינוּ**), participle **יָלִין** Ex. 16, 8. Num. 14, 27. 17, 20, to be stubborn, obstinate: in the latter sense from the form **יָלִין** only **יָלִין** is found, Ex. 17, 3. Other examples are *Niph'al* **נִפְּלָה** he was circumcised, Gen. 17, 26 sq.; participle 34, 22 (from **נָפַל**, not **נָפַל**); **נָעַר** he is waked up, Zech. 2, 17 (see above, letter *v*); *Hiph'il* **הִנָּחָה** Lam. 1, 8; **יָלִין** Prov. 4, 21.

ff Perhaps the same explanation applies to some forms of verbs *first guttural* with *Dages forte implicitum*, which others derive differently or would emend, e.g. **וְהִנָּחָה** for **וְהִנָּחָה** and she hastened (from **חָנַח**) Job 31, 5; **וְהִנָּחָה** (another reading **וְהִנָּחָה**) 1 Sam. 15, 19. 25, 14 (14, 32 *Q^are*) from **וְהִנָּחָה** or **וְהִנָּחָה** to fly at anything. Both, as far as the form is concerned, would be correct *apocopated imperfections* from **וְהִנָּחָה** and **וְהִנָּחָה** (ל"ה), but these stems only occur with a wholly different meaning.

gg 10. Verbs with a consonantal *Wāw* for their second radical, are inflected throughout like the strong form, provided the first or third radical is not a weak letter, e.g. **וְהִנָּחָה**, *imperfect* **וְהִנָּחָה** to be white; **וְהִנָּחָה**, *imperfect* **וְהִנָּחָה** to expire; **וְהִנָּחָה** to be wide; **וְהִנָּחָה** to cry; **וְהִנָּחָה**, *imperfect* **וְהִנָּחָה** to act wickedly; **וְהִנָּחָה** to bend, *Hiithpa'el* **וְהִנָּחָה** to bend oneself; and this is especially the case with verbs which are at the same time *l"i*, e.g. **וְהִנָּחָה**, *Pi'el* **וְהִנָּחָה** to command, **וְהִנָּחָה** to wait, **וְהִנָּחָה** to drink, *Pi'el* **וְהִנָּחָה** (on **וְהִנָּחָה** Is. 16, 9, see § 75. *dd*) and *Hiph'il* **וְהִנָּחָה** to give to drink, &c.

§ 73. Verbs middle *I* (*vulgo* *v'v*), e.g. **וְהִנָּחָה** to discern. *Paradigm N.*

a 1. These verbs agree, as regards their structure, exactly with verbs *v'v*, and in contrast to them may be termed verbs *'ayin-i*, from the characteristic vowel of the *imperfect*, *imperative*, and *infinitive construct*. In the *perfect Qal* the monosyllabic stem, as in *v'v*, has *ā* lengthened from *ä*, thus: **וְהִנָּחָה** he has set; *infinitive absolute* **וְהִנָּחָה**, *imperative* **וְהִנָּחָה**, *imperfect* **וְהִנָּחָה**, *jussive* **וְהִנָּחָה** (§ 48. *g*), *imperfect consecutive* **וְהִנָּחָה**.—The *perfect Qal* of some verbs used to be treated as having a double set of forms, a regular series, and others like *Hiph'il* without the preformative, e.g. **וְהִנָּחָה** Dan. 10, 1; **וְהִנָּחָה** Dan. 9, 2, also **וְהִנָּחָה** Ps. 139, 2; **וְהִנָּחָה** thou strivest, Job 33, 13, also **וְהִנָּחָה** Lam. 3, 58. The above *perfects* (*v'v*, *l"i*, &c.) might no doubt be taken as forms *middle i* (properly *i*), the *i* of which has been lengthened to *i* (like

the *u* lengthened to *u* in the *imperfect Qal* of *קָם*. It is more probable, however, that they are really shortened forms of *Hiph'il*. This is supported by the fact that, especially in the case of *בָּן*, the shortened forms are few and probably all late, while the corresponding unshortened forms with the same meaning are very numerous, e. g. *perfect* *הָבִין* (but *בָּן* Dan. 10, 1), *infinitive* *הָבִין* (but *inf. abs.* *בָּן* Prov. 23, 1), *imperative* *הָבִן* (but Dan. 9, 23 *הָבִין* immediately before *וְהָבִן*, also *בָּנִי* three times, and *בָּנִי* Ps. 5, 2), *participle* *מְבָרֵךְ*¹. Elsewhere *Hiph'il*-forms are in use along with actual *Qal*-forms with the same meaning, thus: *פָּרַס* (also *פָּרַס*), *placing* (but only in *Job* 4, 20, which, with the critically untenable *הָשִׁיטוּ* Ezek. 21, 21, is the only instance of *שָׁט* in *Hiph'il*), *glancing*, also in *perfect* *פָּצַ*. As *passives* we find a few apparent *imperfects Hoph'al*, which are really (according to § 53. u) *imperfects passive of Qal*, e. g. *יָשַׁר* from *שָׁר* to *sing*, *יָשַׁת* from *שָׁת* to *set*.

2. The above-mentioned *Hiph'il*-forms might equally well be *b* derived from verbs ע"י²; and the influence of the analogy of verbs ע"י is distinctly seen in the *Niph'al* *נָבִין*, *Pi'lel* *בִּלֵּן* and *Hithpa'el* *הִתְבִּינִן*. The very close relation existing between verbs ע"י and ע"י is evident also from the fact that from some stems both forms occur side by side in *Qal*, thus from *הָלַל* to *turn round*, *imperative* also *הָלִי* Mic. 4, 10; *שָׁם* to *place*, *infinitive construct* commonly *שָׁם*, *imperfect* *יָשִׁים*, but Ex. 4, 11 *יָשִׁים*. In other verbs one form is, at any rate, the more common, e. g. *נָגַל* to *exult* (*נָגַל* only Prov. 23, 24 *K^ethibh*); from *לָלַן* (perhaps denominative from *לָלַל*) to *spend the night*, *לָלַן* occurs six times as *infinitive construct*, *לָלַן* only in Gen. 24, 23; the *imperative* is always *לָלַן*, &c.—Of verbs ע"י the most common are, *שָׁת* to *set*, *רָבַ* to *strive*, *דָּן* to *judge*, *שָׂשׂ* to *rejoice*; comp. also *perfect* *פָּל* (*middle Yôdh* in Arabic) to *comprehend*, to *measure*, Is. 40, 12; *עָטָם* (as in

¹ Since *בָּנָה* Ps. 139, 2, might be intended for *בָּנָה*, there remains really no form of *בָּן* which must necessarily be explained as a *Qal*. Nevertheless it is not impossible that all the above instances of *Hiph'il*-forms, parallel with *Qal*-forms of the same meaning, might be merely due to a secondary formation from the *imperfects Qal* *יָבִין*, *יָשִׁים*, &c., which were wrongly regarded as *imperfects Hiph'il*: so Barth, *ZDMG*. xliii. p. 190 sq., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 119 sq.

² Against the view of earlier grammarians that all supposed ע"י-forms are alike to be classed as ע"י, compare the exhaustive statement of the case by Nöldeke in *ZDMG*. 1883, p. 525 sqq.

Arabic and Syriac) *to rush upon*, and the denominative *perfect* פָּרַח (from פָּרַח) *to pass the summer*, Is. 18, 6. On the other hand, וְיִשְׁכּוּ and they shall fish them, Jer. 16, 16, generally explained as *perfect Qal*, denominative from יָשָׁה *fish*, probably represents a denominative *Pi'el*, וְיִשְׁכּוּ.

c Corresponding to verbs properly וָע, mentioned in § 72. gg, there are certain verbs וָע with consonantal *Yddh*, as אָבַח *to hate*, פָּחַח *to faint*, הָיָה *to become, to be*, הָיָה *to live*.

d Rem. 1. In the *perfect Qal* 3rd *fem. sing.* וְלָנָה occurs once, Zech. 5, 4, for וְלָנָה, with the weakening of the toneless *ā* to *ē* (like the *fem. participle* וְלָנָה Is. 59, 5); comp. the analogous examples in § 48. l and § 80. i.—2nd *sing. masc.* וְשָׁחַח Ps. 90, 8, *Q'rel* (before ו; cf. § 72. s); 1st *sing. once* וְשָׁחַח Ps. 73, 28, *mil'ra'*, without any apparent reason; 1st *plur.* וְלָנָה Jud. 19, 13 for *lān-nā*. The lengthened *imperative* has the tone on the ultima before gutturals, וְהָיָה Ps. 35, 1; see further, § 72. s.—Examples of the *infinite absolute* are: רָב *litigando*, Jud. 11, 25. Job 40, 2; שָׁחַח Jer. 42, 15; שָׁחַח *ponendo*, Is. 22, 7. On the other hand, וְיָשָׁה Jer. 50, 34, וְיָשָׁה Prov. 23, 1, חוּל תְּחִיל Ezek. 30, 16 *K'rh*, are irregular; for the last the *Q'rel* requires חוּל תְּחִיל; comp. § 113. x.

e 2. The *shortened imperfect* usually has the form וְיָשָׁח, וְיָשָׁח; more rarely the tone is moved back, e. g. וְיָשָׁח Jud. 6, 31; cf. Ex. 23, 1. 1 Sam. 9, 20. So with *wāw consecutive* וְיָשָׁח and he placed, וְיָשָׁח and he perceived; with a middle guttural וְיָשָׁח 1 Sam. 25, 14 (see § 72. ee). As jussive of וְיָשָׁח is found in Jud. 19, 20 (in *pause*) and Job 17, 2, for וְיָשָׁח.

f 3. As *participle active Qal* וְיָשָׁח spending the night, occurs once, Neh. 13, 21; *participle passive* וְיָשָׁח Num. 24, 21. 1 Sam. 9, 24. Obad. 4; *feminine* וְיָשָׁח 2 Sam. 13, 32, in the *Q'rel*, even according to the reading of the Oriental schools (see p. 36, note 2): the *K'rh* has וְיָשָׁח.—A *passive of Qal* (cf. above, § 52. e and s, § 53. w) from וְיָשָׁח may perhaps be seen in וְיָשָׁח Gen. 50, 26 (also Gen. 24, 33 *K'rh* וְיָשָׁח, *Q'rel* וְיָשָׁח; the Samaritan in both places has וְיָשָׁח), and also in וְיָשָׁח Ex. 30, 32, Samaritan וְיָשָׁח. Against the explanation of וְיָשָׁח as a *Hoph'al*-form from וְיָשָׁח, Barth (*Jubelschrift . . . des Dr. I. Hildesheimer*, Berlin, 1890, p. 151) rightly urges that the only example of a *Hiph'il* of וְיָשָׁח is the doubtful וְיָשָׁח, which is probably an *f*-imperfect of *Qal*.—The explanation of וְיָשָׁח as a *passive of Qal* arising from *yiysam*, &c. = *yuiysam* (so Barth, *ibid.*, note 1) is certainly also unconvincing, so that the correctness of the traditional reading is open to question.

g 4. In verbs נָע the *N* almost always retains its consonantal value; they are, therefore, to be regarded as verbs *'Ayin Guttural* (§ 64). The only exception is נָע they are beautiful (from נָע *Pi'el* of נָע, properly נָע) Is. 52, 7. Cant. 1, 10.—Very doubtful on the other hand is נָע Eccles. 12, 5 as *imperfect Hiph'il* (for נָע); if the form has been correctly transmitted, it should rather be referred to נָע, and regarded as incorrectly written for נָע.

§ 74. Verbs א"י, e.g. מצא to find. Paradigm O.

The א in these verbs, as in verbs א"ד, is treated in some cases *a* as a consonant, i.e. as a guttural, in others as having no consonantal value (as a quiescent or vowel letter), viz.:

1. In those forms which terminate with the א, the final syllable has always the regular long vowels, e.g. מצא, מצא, מצא, מצא, i.e. the א simply quiesces in the long vowel, without the latter being subject to any change whatever. It is just possible that after the altogether heterogeneous vowel א the א may originally have preserved a certain consonantal value. On the other hand, if the final א unites with a preceding א (as in the *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *imperative Qal*, in the *perfect Niph'al*, and in *Pu'al* and *Hoph'al*) this א is necessarily lengthened to א, by § 27. *g*, as standing in an open syllable; e.g. מצא, מצא, &c.

The *imperfect* and *imperative Qal* invariably have א in the final syllable, on the analogy of verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*; comp., however, § 76. *e*.—In the *imperfect Hithpa'el* א occurs in the final syllable not only (according to § 54. *k*) in the principal pause (Num. 31, 23), or immediately before it (Job 10, 16), or with the lesser disjunctives (Lev. 21, 1. 4. Num. 19, 13. 20), but even without the pause with *Mer'kha*, Num. 6, 7, and even before *Maqqeph* in Num. 19, 12.

2. When א stands at the end of a syllable before an affirmative *c* beginning with a consonant (א, א), it likewise quiesces with the preceding vowel; e.g. in the *perfect Qal* (and *Hoph'al*, see below) quiescing with א it regularly becomes *Qames* (מצא for מצא, &c.); but in the *perfect* of all the other active and reflexive conjugations it is preceded by *Sere* (מצא, &c.), and in the *imperative* and *imperfect* by *S'ghol*, מצא, מצא.

(a) The *S'ghol* of these forms of the imperfect and imperative might be considered throughout as a modification, and at the same time a lengthening of an original א (see § 8. *a*). In the same way the א of the *perfect* forms in *Pi'el*, *Hithpa'el*, and *Hiph'il* might be traced to an original א (as in other cases the א and א in the final syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc. perfect* of these conjugations), although this א may have only been attenuated from an original א. According to another, and perhaps a more correct explanation, both the *Sere* and the *S'ghol* are due to the analogy of verbs א"ד (§ 75. *f*) in consequence of the close relation between the two classes, comp. § 75. *nn*.—No form of this kind occurs in *Pu'al*; in the *perfect Hoph'al* only the 2nd *masc. sing.* מצא Ezek. 40, 4, lengthened according to rule.

(b) As before the suffixes attached by a connecting vowel (e.g. מצא) the א retains its consonantal value, so also before א and א, e.g. מצא Cant. 8, 1; מצא Ezek. 28, 13 (comp. § 65. *k*), not מצא, &c., since these suffixes, by

§ 58. *f*, are likewise attached to the verb-form by a connecting vowel in the form of *Šwd mobile*.—As *infinitive Qal* with suffix notice **מִצְוָהְךָ** Ezek. 25, 6; *participle* with suffix **בְּרָאֲךָ** Is. 43, 1; as *infinitive Pī'el* **בְּמִצְוֹתֵיכֶם**.—Instead of the doubly anomalous form **יִקְרָא** Jer. 23, 6 (for **יִקְרָאוּ**) probably **יִקְרָא** is intended.

- f* 3. When **מ** begins a syllable (consequently before affirmatives which consist of or begin with a vowel, as well as before suffixes) it is necessarily a firm consonant, and the form then follows the analogy of the strong verb, e. g. **מִצְוָה** *mās'ā*, **מִצְוֵי**, &c. (in *pause* **מִצְוֵי**, **מִצְוֵי**).

REMARKS.

- g* 1. Verbs *middle E*, like **מָלֵא** *to be full*, retain the *Šere* also in the other persons of the *perfect*, e. g. **מָלֵאתִי**; **יִמְלֵאתֶם**; **יִמְלֵאוּ** Est. 7, 5 are due to their transitive use. Instead of **מִצְוָה** the form **קִרְאָת** *she names*, on the analogy of the *לִי'el*-forms noticed in § 75. *m*, occurs in Is. 7, 14 (from **קִרְאָת**, comp. § 44. *f*), and with a different meaning (*it befalls*) in Deut. 31, 29. Jer. 44, 23, in both places before **מ**, and hence, probably, to avoid a hiatus (on the other hand, **וְהִמְלֵאתָ** Ex. 5, 16, could only be the 2nd *sing. masc.*; the text which is obviously corrupt should probably with the LXX be emended to **לְעִפְרָיִם**); in *Niph'al* **נִמְלֵאתָ** Ps. 118, 23; in *Hoph'al* **הִמְלֵאתָ** Gen. 33, 11.
- h* 2. The *infim. Qal* occurs sometimes on the analogy of verbs *לִי'el* (**גִּלְיוֹת**), &c., see § 75. *m*) in the feminine form; so always **מָלֵאת** *to fill* (as distinguished from **מָלֵא** *fullness*), Lev. 8, 33. 12, 4. 6. 25, 30. Jer. 29, 10. Ezek. 5, 2, also written **מִלְאוֹת** Jer. 25, 12. Job 20, 22, and elsewhere, and **מִלְוֹתָ** Est. 1, 5. Comp. further, **קִרְאָת** Jud. 8, 1; **שִׁמְלֹתָ** Prov. 8, 13; before suffixes, Ezek. 33, 12, and likewise in *Niph'al*. Zech. 13, 4; also in *Pī'el* **לְמִלְוֹתָ** Ex. 31, 5. 35, 33, or **לְמִלְוֹתָ** Dan. 9, 2, and elsewhere *K'ithbā*; with suffix 2 Sam. 21, 2.—On the (aramaizing) *infinitives* **מִשְׁלֹת** and **מִשְׁלֹתָ**, see § 45. *e*; on **לְקִרְאָתָ** *obviam*, § 19. *h*. —**מִצְוֹתֵיכֶם** *when ye find*, Gen. 32, 20, stands, according to § 93. *g*, for **מִצְוֹתֵיכֶם**. The tone of the lengthened *imperative* **רַפְּאֵה** Ps. 41, 5 as *Mil'ra'* (before **נִפְשִׁי**) is to be explained on rhythmical grounds; comp. the analogous cases in § 72. *s*. —The 2nd *fem. plur. imperative* in Ruth 1, 9 has, according to Qimḥi, the form **מִצְוֵי** and in verse 20 **קִרְאוּ**; on the other hand, the Mantua edition and Ginsburg, on good authority, read **מִצְוֵי**, **קִרְאוּ**.
- i* 3. The *participle fem.* is commonly contracted, e. g. **מִצְוָה** (for **מִצְוֹתָ**) 2 Sam. 18, 22, comp. Est. 2, 15; so *Niph'al* **נִמְלֵאתָ** Dent. 30, 11. Zech. 5, 7, and *Hoph'al*, Gen. 38, 25; less frequent forms are, **מִצְוֹתָ** Cant. 8, 10; **יִמְלֵאתָ** 1 Ki. 10, 22 (comp. § 76. *b*, **יִמְלֵאתָ** beside **יִמְלֵאתָ** as *infinitive construct* from **יִמְלֵא**) and without **מ** (see letter *h*) **יִמְלֵא** (from **יִמְלֵא**) Dent. 28, 57. In the forms **חִמְלָאִים** *sinning*, 1 Sam. 14, 33, comp. Ps. 99, 6; **בְּרָאִים** *feigning them*, Neh. 6, 8, the **מ** is syncopated, and is only retained orthographically (§ 23. *c*) after the retraction of its vowel; see the analogous cases in § 75. *so*.
- h* 4. Frequently an **מ** which is quiescent is omitted in writing (§ 23. *f*): (*a*) in the middle of the word, e. g. **בְּנֵי** 1 Sam. 25, 8; **מִצְוֵי** Num. 11, 11, comp. Job

1, 21; צָמְחָה Jud. 4, 19, comp. Job 32, 18. In the *imperfect* הִצְמִיחַ Jer. 9, 17. Zech. 5, 9. Ruth 1, 14 (on the other hand, the same form occurs with *Yōdh* pleonastic after the manner of verbs ל"ה Ezek. 23, 49, according to the common reading; comp. § 76. *b* and Jer. 50, 20); in *Pi'el* אֶחְמֹצֶנָה Gen. 31, 39; and also in *Niph'al* נִצְמַחְתָּם Lev. 11, 43; comp. Jos. 2, 16. (*b*) at the end of the word; וְיָבוּ 1 Ki. 12, 12 *K'athbh*; *Hiph'il* הִצְמִיחַ 2 Ki. 13, 6, comp. Is. 53, 10 (הִצְמִיחַ for הִצְמִיחַ *perfect Hiph'il* of הִצִּיחַ formed after the manner of verbs ל"ה); in the *imperfect Hiph'il* יִצְמַח Ps. 55, 16 *K'athbh*; יִצֵּי Ps. 141, 5; אָבִי 1 Ki. 21, 19. Mic. 1, 15; in the *infinitive*, Jer. 32, 35; in the *participle*, 2 Sam. 5, 2. 1 Ki. 21, 21. Jer. 19, 15. 39, 16, all in *K'athbh* (כִּבִּי), always before ה, hence perhaps only a scribal error).

5. In the *jussive*, *imperfect consecutive*, and *imperative Hiph'il* a number of cases occur with *f* in the final syllable; comp. יִצְמַח Is. 36, 14 (in the parallel passages 2 Ki. 18, 29. 2 Chron. 32, 15 יִצְמַח); וְיִצְמַח Neh. 8, 2 (before *ע*); וְיִצְמַח 2 Ki. 21, 11 (comp. 1 Ki. 16, 2. 21, 22); וְיִצְמַח 2 Ki. 6, 29; וְיִצְמַח Deut. 4, 20. 2 Ki. 11, 12. Ps. 78, 16. 105, 43; *imperative* הִצְמִיחַ Jer. 17, 18; הִצְמִיחַ Is. 43, 8 (in both cases before *ע*). If the tradition be correct (which at least in the defectively written forms appears very doubtful) the retention of the *f* is to be accounted for by the open syllable; while in the closed syllable of the 3rd *sing. masc. and fem.*, and the 2nd *sing. masc.* after 1 *consecutive* the *f* is always reduced to *z*. In the examples before *ע* considerations of euphony may also have had some influence (comp. § 75. *ah*).—In Ezek. 40, 3, Baer reads with the Western school וְיִצְמַח, while the Orientals read in the *K'athbh* וְיִצְמַח, and in the *Q'ath* וְיִצְמַח.

On the transition of verbs ל"ה to forms of ל"ה see § 75. *nn*.

§ 75. Verbs ל"ה, e.g. הִצִּיחַ to reveal. Paradigm P.

These verbs, like the verbs צָמַח (§§ 69, 70), comprise two different *a* classes, viz. those originally ל"ו and those originally ל"י, which in Arabic, and even more in Ethiopic, are still clearly distinguished. In Hebrew, instead of the original ו or י at the end of the word, a ה appears as a purely orthographic indication of a final vowel (§ 23. *k*); hence both classes are called ל"ה, e.g. הִצִּיחַ for הִצִּיחַ he has revealed; שָׁלַח for שָׁלַח he has rested. By far the greater number of these verbs are, however, treated as originally ל"י; only isolated forms occur of verbs ל"ו.

הִשָּׁלַח to be at rest may be recognized as originally ל"י, in the forms in which *b* the Wāw appears as a strong consonant, comp. 1st *sing. perfect Qal* הִשָּׁלַח Job 3, 26, the *participle* שָׁלַח and the derivative שָׁלַח rest; on the other hand the *imperfect* is יִשָּׁלַח (with *Yōdh*). In עָנָה (Arab. عَنِ) to answer, and עָנָה (Arab. عَنِ) to be afflicted, oppressed, are to be seen two verbs originally distinct,

¹ On the Méša' stone, line 5, וְיַעֲנֵנִי and he oppressed occurs as 3rd *sing. imperfect Pi'el*, and in line 6, אֶעֱנֶנּוּ I will oppress as 1st *sing.*

which have been assimilated in Hebrew (see the *Lexicon*, s. v. הָיָה).—In Aramaic, the confusion of these forms is carried still farther, verbs הָיָה also coinciding with verbs הָיָה, i. e. with verbs הָיָה and הָיָה of the Arabic.

Of quite a different class are those verbs of which the third radical is a *consonantal* ה (distinguished by *Mapptiq*). These are inflected throughout like verbs *tertiæ gutturalis*. Comp. § 65 note on the heading.

- c The grammatical structure of verbs הָיָה (see Paradigm *P*) is based on the following laws:

1. In all forms in which the original *Yôdh* or *Wâw* would have to stand at the end of the word, it is dropped (comp. § 24. g) and ה takes its place as an orthographic indication of the preceding long vowel. Such an indication would have been indispensable, even on practical grounds, in the still unvocalized consonantal text. But even after the addition of the vowel signs, the orthographic rule remained, with insignificant exceptions (see § 8. k, and *ā* in הָיָה, &c.), that a final vowel must be indicated by a vowel letter. In verbs הָיָה, the ה which is here employed as a vowel letter is preceded by the same vowel in the same part of the verb throughout all the conjugations. Thus the endings are—

הָ in all perfects, הָיָה, הָיָה, הָיָה, &c.

הָ in all imperfects and participles, הָיָה, הָיָה, &c.

הָ in all imperatives, הָיָה, הָיָה, &c.

הָ in the infinitive absolute (הָיָה, &c.), except *Hiph'al*, *Hoph'al*, and generally also *Pi'el*, see letters *aa* and *ff*.

The *participle passive Qal* alone forms an exception, the original *y* reappearing at the end, הָיָה; and so also some derived nouns (§ 84a, letter *c*, *e*, and elsewhere).

The *infinitive construct* always has the ending הָ (with ה *feminine*); *Qal* הָיָה, *Pi'el* הָיָה, &c., except *הָיָה* Jud. 13, 21. 1 Sam. 3, 21.

- d These forms may be explained as follows:—in the *perfect Qal* הָיָה stands, according to the above, for (י) הָיָה, and, similarly, in *Niph'al*, *Pu'al* and *Hoph'al*. The *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* may be based on the forms הָיָה (§ 52. l; and § 54. k), and *Hiph'al* on the form הָיָה, on the analogy of the *ā* in the second syllable of the Arabic *'aqtālā* (§ 53. a). Perhaps, however, the final *ā* of these conjugations simply follows the analogy of the other conjugations.

- e The explanation of the final tone-bearing הָ of the *imperfect* is a matter of dispute. The least probable is the view that it is a contraction of the original *Yôdh* (resolved into *i*) with a preceding *ā*; for the language elsewhere always has *e* as the contraction of the diphthong *ai*, which can only be weakened to *i* (see letter *f*). According to Rödiger the *ē* (הָ) represents the more precise

characteristic vowels of the corresponding strong formations, which have been retained in Arabic and Ethiopic with greater purity in these verbs. Thus יָגַל corresponds to the Arab. *yagīlā* (vulgar *yagīl*), Eth. *yēgīlā*; יָבַק Arab. *yabkī*, Eth. *yēbki*; יָחַי Arab. *yahyā*, Eth. *yēhyaw*; יָרַע Arab. *yar'ā*, Eth. *yēr'ay*. So also in *Pīl* יָנַח Arab. *yūṣall*; *Hiph'il* יָרַח Arab. *yur'ā*, &c. Just as, according to these examples, the characteristic vowel has been retained throughout in Arabic and Ethiopic, so also in Hebrew it might be inferred that in the imperfects of the several conjugations of ה"ו verbs, various vowels were originally used, which only later, in an endeavour after a complete analogy, uniformly became *S^gghōl*. In favour of this explanation is the uniformity of inflexion in the *perfect*, *imperfect*, and *participle*. It may, however, be questioned, whether it is further necessary to assume an *ā* as the original vowel of the final syllable throughout the *imperfects*, and, hence, to regard the tone-bearing *S^gghōl* in all the forms, as a modification and partial lengthening of the *ā* (as in יָלַח for *malh*) instead of the full lengthening to *ā*. According to Barth, *Nominalbildung*, i. p. xxx sqq., with § 136, Rem., and *ZDMG*. xliv. p. 695 sq. (against Philippi's objections in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, 1890, p. 356 sq.), the termination הַ in the *imperfect* and *participle* of the active conjugations arose from an original *īy*, and in the passives from original *ay*, as יָגַל from *yigīly*, יָגַל from *yiggally*, יָנַח from *yāgally*, &c.¹, but יָנַח from *yāgullay*, יָגַל from *yāglay*. This theory has the advantage of tracing the active participles of *Qal* not to forms with *ā*, but, as would be expected, to forms with *i* in the second syllable. It still remains unexplained, however, why final *īy* should have become הַ in these forms, and not יַ as in other cases. Nor does this view supply any satisfactory explanation of the הַ in the *construct state sing.* of the active participles.

2. When the original *Yōdh* stands at the end of the syllable before *f* an affirmative beginning with a consonant (ת, נ) there arises (*a*) in the *perfects*, primarily the diphthong *ay* (יַ). In the middle of the word this ought always to be contracted to *ē* (יֶ), but this *ē* is only found consistently in the passive conjugations, whilst regularly in *Qal*, and frequently in the other active and reflexive conjugations (especially in *Pr'el*), it is weakened to *ē* (comp. letters *x*, *z*, *ee*, and § 27. n).—(b) In the *imperfects* and *imperatives*, יַ with the tone always appears before the affirmative הַ. Here again the question recurs (see above) whether this יַ is to be regarded as an equivalent for יַ (i.e. *ē* contracted from *ay*), or whether after the rejection of the *Yōdh* (as in the 3rd *sing.*) *ā* has been modified to *S^gghōl*. In the latter case the *Yōdh*, which is almost always written after

¹ So also M. Lambert, *Journal Asiatique*, 1893, i. p. 285, but with the further modification that *ay* was always substituted for the original *īy* (with *Yōdh* radical).

S^gghôl, must be regarded simply as an orthographic survival of the original form.

g **Summary.** Accordingly before affirmatives beginning with a consonant the principal vowel is—

In the perfect *Qal* *l*, e. g. לָלַךְ ;

In the perfects of the other active and reflexive conjugations, sometimes *ê*, sometimes *i*, לָלַחַת and לָלַחַת ; לָלַחַת and לָלַחַת ;

In the perfect passive always *ê*, e. g. לָלַחַת ;

In the imperfects and imperatives always *â*, e. g. לָלַחַת , לָלַחַת .

The diphthongal forms have been throughout retained in Arabic and Ethiopic; only as an exception and in the popular language is the diphthong contracted. In Aramaic the contracted forms predominate, yet the Syriac, for example, also has in *Qal* and *pers. sing. g^lait* (but 1st *pers. sing.* לָלַחַת), and so too the Western Aramaic לָלַחַת , but also לָלַחַת .

h 3. Before the vocalic affirmatives (לָ , לָ , לָ) the *Yôdh* is usually dropped altogether, e. g. לָלַחַת (ground-form *gâlâyâd*), לָלַחַת , *participle fem.* לָלַחַת , *plur. masc.* לָלַחַת ; yet the old full forms also not infrequently occur, especially in *pause*, see letter *u*. The elision of the *Yôdh* takes place regularly before *suffixes*, e. g. לָלַחַת (letter *ll*).

i 4. In the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect*, the feminine ending לָ is appended to the stem; hence, after elision of the *Yôdh*, arose properly forms like לָלַחַת , with *â* in the final syllable with the tone. This form, however, has been but rarely preserved (see below, letter *m*). The analogy of the other forms has had so much influence, that the common ending לָ was added pleonastically to the ending לָ . Before the לָ the vowel of the ending לָ , which thus loses the tone, becomes *S^gwdâ*, and thus there arise such forms as לָלַחַת , לָלַחַת , &c. (but in *pause* לָלַחַת , &c.).

For similar cases see § 70. *d*; § 91. *m*.

k 5. Finally, a strongly-marked peculiarity of verbs לָ is the rejection of the ending לָ in forming the *jussive* and the *imperfect consecutive*. This shortening occurs in all the conjugations, and sometimes also involves further changes in the vocalization (see Rems. 3, 8, 11, 16). Similarly, in some conjugations a *shortened imperative* (comp. § 48. *k*) is formed by *apocope* of the final לָ (see Rems. 12, 16).

l 6. The ordinary form of the *imperfect* with the ending לָ serves in verbs לָ to express the *cohortative* also (§ 48. *c*); comp. Gen. 1, 26.

2, 18, &c. With a final ה- there occur only: in *Qal*, אָשַׁע Ps. 119, 117, אָחַס (with the ' retained, see below, letter *u*) Ps. 77, 4; and in *Hithpa'el*, וְשָׁחַת Is. 41, 23 (with *Tiphḥa*, therefore in lesser pause).

REMARKS.

I. On *Qal*.

1. The older form of the *fem.* of the 3rd *sing. perf.* בָּלָה, mentioned above, ^m letter *i* (cf. § 74. *g*), also occurs in שָׁלַח (before א) Lev. 25, 21 (comp. 2 Ki. 9, 37 *ḥshbk*)¹; likewise in *Hiph'il* הִרְצָה (before א) Lev. 26, 34; הִלָּחַת Ezek. 24, 12; and in *Hoph'al* הִנָּלַח (before ') Jer. 13, 19.—The 2nd *sing. fem.* is also written יָתָּ; thus in the *Textus receptus* וְהָיִיתְ 2 Sam. 14, 2, and always in Baer's editions (since 1872), as in most other verbs; וְהָיִיתְ and וְהָיִיתְ Is. 57, 8; וְעָשִׂיתְ Jer. 2, 23. Ezek. 16, 48, &c. (so וְהִצָּאתְ 1 Ki. 17, 13 from הִצָּא). In the 3rd *pers. plur.* the tone, instead of keeping its usual place (בָּלְוּ, &c.), is retracted in Ps. 37, 20, בָּלְוּ, both on account of the *pause* and also in rhythmical antithesis to the preceding בָּלְוּ; also in Is. 16, 8 הָעָוָה (according to Delitzsch for the sake of the assonance with הָעָוָה); and in Job 24, 1 הָעָוָה.—On the tone of the *perfect consecutive* see § 49. *k*.

2. The *infim. absol.* frequently has ל (probably a survival of the older orthography) for ה', e.g. הָיָה Gen. 18, 18; עָשָׂה Jer. 4, 18, &c. Ezek. 31, 11; קָנָה 2 Sam. 24, 24; רָאָה Gen. 26, 28. Is. 6, 9 (comp. 1 Sam. 6, 12), &c., beside רָאָה. The form שָׁתוּת Is. 22, 13 (beside שָׁתוּ in the same verse) appears to have been chosen on account of its similarity in sound to שָׁחַת; so in Is. 42, 20 *Q^{re}* and Hos. 10, 4, אָלוּת (unless it is a substantive, *oaths*); and בָּרוּת; cf. also עָרוּת Hab. 3, 13.—Conversely, instead of the *infinitive construct* בָּלוּת such forms are occasionally found as בָּלוּ or בָּלָה, comp. רָאָה Gen. 48, 11; קָנָה Prov. 16, 16; עָשָׂה Gen. 50, 20. Ps. 101, 3, also עָשָׂה Gen. 31, 28 (comp. Prov. 31, 4), and even with the suffix הוּ the very remarkable form עָשָׂהוּ Ex. 18, 18².—The feminine form רָאָה (for רָאוּת) Ezek. 28, 17, analogous to nouns like בָּאָה (comp. § 45. *d*), is strange, but הָיָה as *infim.* Ezek. 21, 15 is quite inexplicable.—The forms הָרָו and הָרָו Is. 59, 13 are to be regarded with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, § 51. *a*, as *infinitives absolute* of the *passive* of *Qal* (see above, § 53. *u*), not of *P^{er}al*.—The 2nd *sing. masc. imperative* הָיִיתְ occurs in the principal pause in Prov. 4, 4 and 7, 2; but probably these forms are simply to be attributed to a Masoretic school, which in general marked the difference between certain forms by the use of *ē* for *ē*, and conversely *ē* for *ē*; comp. the analogous examples in § 52. *n*, and especially § 75. *hh*, also Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Bibl. Aram.* § 17. 2, Rem. 1.—On the reading וְרָאִינָה Cant. 3, 11 (for וְרָאִינָה, on the analogy of the reading וְרָאִינָה, &c., § 74. *k*), see Baer's note on the passage.

¹ In the Siloam inscription also (see above, § 2. *d*), line 3, הָיָה may be read הָיָה quite as well as הָיָה.

² All these infinitives construct in *ē*, in the Pentateuch, belong to what is called document E; comp. § 69. *m*, second note.

- o 3. The *shortening* of the *imperfect* (see above, letter *k* and the note on letter *kh*) occasions in *Qal* the following changes :

(a) As a rule the first radical receives a helping *S^ghhl*, or, if the second radical is a guttural, a helping *Pathah* (according to § 28. e). Thus יָגַל for יָגַל; וַיָּבֹז and *he despised*, Gen. 25, 34; וַיִּבֶן and *he built*; יִשֵּׁעַ *he looks*; וַיִּסְחַר and *he destroyed*, Gen. 7, 23.

- p (b) The *ʾ* of the preformative under these circumstances is sometimes lengthened to *ē*, e.g. יִרְאֶה *he sees*. This, however, mostly happens only after the preformative ת, whilst after י the homogeneous *ʾ* remains, e.g. וַיִּבְלֵל (but וַיִּבְלֵל), וַיִּתְּנֵם (but וַיִּתְּנֵם); with middle guttural וַיִּתְּנֵם Job 17, 7 (from וַיִּתְּנֵם). The unusual position of the tone in וַיִּתְּנֵם (Baer and Ginsburg וַיִּתְּנֵם) Zech. 9, 5, וַיִּתְּנֵם (Baer and Ginsburg וַיִּתְּנֵם) Mic. 7, 10, and וַיִּרְאֶה (with *ē*) Gen. 41, 33, can only partially be explained on rhythmical, or orthophonic grounds. Comp. below, letter *kh*.

- q (c) The helping vowel is elsewhere not used under the circumstances mentioned in § 28. d; וַיִּשְׁכַּח Num. 21, 1. Jer. 41, 10, comp. וַיִּפְתָּח Job 31, 27; on the other hand, with *ʾ* lengthened into *ē* (see letter *p*) וַיִּשְׁכַּח, וַיִּבְרַךְ, וַיִּרְדָּ, וַיִּשְׁכַּח. The form וַיִּרְאֶה *he sees*, occurs parallel with וַיִּרְאֶה and *he saw* (but 3rd fem. always וַיִּרְאֶה), the latter with the original *Pathah* on account of the following ר, and identical with the 3rd sing. masc. of the *imperfect consecutive* וַיִּרְאֶה, 2 Ki. 11, 4.

- r (d) Examples of verbs *primae gutturalis* (§ 63), and at the same time וַיַּעַשׂ, are וַיַּעַשׂ in *pause* וַיַּעַשׂ and *he made*, from וַיַּעַשׂ; וַיַּעַן and *he answered*, from וַיַּעַן, the shortened imperfect in such verbs being always identical with the corresponding forms in *Hiphʿl*. On some similar forms of וַיַּעַן see § 76. d.—In the following cases the initial (hard) guttural does not affect the form: וַיִּחַר and *he was wroth*, וַיִּחַן and *he encamped* (3rd plur. וַיִּחַן), וַיִּחַד (with *Dages lene* and *S^gwd*) *let it rejoice*, Job 3, 6; cf. Ex. 18, 9.—On וַיִּזַּח, וַיִּזַּח, וַיִּזַּח (*ל* *as well as* *וַיִּזַּח*), &c., see § 76. b, c, f.

- s (e) The verbs וַיִּחַי *to be*, and וַיִּחַי *to live*, of which the shortened imperfects ought to be *yiky* and *yiky*, change these forms to וַיִּחַי and וַיִּחַי, the second *Ydh* being resolved into *ʾ* at the end of the word; but in *pause* (§ 29. n) וַיִּחַי, וַיִּחַי, with the original *ā* modified to *S^ghhl* with the tone, (comp. also nouns like בָּכִי for *bakhky*, in *pause* בָּכִי; עֹנִי for *ʾony*, &c., § 84 a, letter c, and § 93. x). For וַיַּעַשׂ, however, in Deut. 32, 18, since no verb וַיַּעַשׂ exists, we must read either וַיַּעַשׂ, or better וַיַּעַשׂ (Samaritan וַיַּעַשׂ) as *imperfect Qal* of וַיַּעַשׂ *to forget*.—Analogous to וַיִּחַי from וַיִּחַי, there occurs once, from וַיִּחַי *to be*, the form וַיִּחַי for וַיִּחַי *he will be*, Eccles. 11, 3 (on the *N* see § 23. z).

- t Moreover, the full forms (without apocope of the וַיַּעַשׂ, comp. § 49. c) frequently occur after *wāw consecutive*, especially in the 1st pers. and in the later Books, e.g. וַיִּרְאֶה and *I saw*, twenty times, and Jos. 7, 21 in *K^hhllh*, but never in the Pentateuch (וַיִּרְאֶה fifteen times, of which three are in the Pent.); וַיַּעַשׂ and *he made*, four times (but וַיַּעַשׂ over 200 times); comp. also 1 Ki. 10, 29 (וַיַּעַשׂ); Deut. 1, 16 (וַיַּעַשׂ), and Gen. 24, 48. So also frequently for the *jussive*, comp.

Gen. 1, 9, 6, 14, 41, 34. Jer. 28, 6.—For the well attested, but meaningless **חִירָא** Job 6, 21 (doubtless caused by the following **חִירָא**) read **חִירָא** *ye see*.

4. The original **י** sometimes appears before the affirmatives beginning with a vowel (comp. above, letters **ה** and **ו**), especially in and before the *pause*, and before the full plural ending **ן**—, or where for any reason an emphasis rests on the word. *Perfect* **חִסִּיָּה** Ps. 57, 2, **חִסִּיָּה** Deut. 32, 37, comp. Ps. 73, 2 **חִסִּיָּה**; *imperative* **חִסִּיָּה** Is. 21, 12. *Imperfect* **יִחִסֵּי** Job 16, 22, 30, 14 (without the *pause*, Ps. 68, 32); **יִחִסֵּי** Ps. 122, 6. Job 12, 6, comp. Ps. 77, 4; **יִחִסֵּי** Deut. 18, 13; Ps. 36, 9: more frequently like **יִחִסֵּי** Ps. 78, 44; Is. 17, 12, 21, 12, 26, 11, 31, 3, 33, 7, 41, 5. Ps. 36, 8, 39, 7, 83, 3; before a suffix, Job 3, 25. Also in Prov. 26, 7 **יִחִסֵּי**, as *perf. Qal* from **יִחִסֵּי**, was perhaps originally intended, but hardly **יִחִסֵּי**, since these full forms, though they may stand out of *pause*, do not begin sentences; **יִחִסֵּי** probably points to **יִחִסֵּי** from **יִחִסֵּי** as the right reading, since the sense requires an intransitive verb. Cf. further, letters **ו**, **ז**, **ח**, **ט**, **כ**, **ל**, **מ**, **נ**, **ס**, **ע**, **פ**, **צ**, **ק**, **ר**, **ש**, **ת**.

5. The *participle active*, besides forms like **עֹלֶה** Jud. 20, 31, &c., **רָאָה** Prov. 20, 12, **ו** has also a *feminine* which retains the 3rd radical **י**, viz. **בֹּכֵיָה** (= **בָּכָה**) weeping, Lam. 1, 16; **הוֹסִיָּה** *tumultuous*, Is. 22, 2 (*plur.* Prov. 1, 21); **צוֹמֵיָה** *spring*, Prov. 31, 27, **פְּרִיָּה** *fruitful*, Ps. 128, 3, *plur.* **אֲתִיּוֹת** *the things that are to come*, Is. 41, 23. With the ordinary strong inflexion **י** appears in **עֹמֵיָה** Cant. 1, 7, but perhaps there also **עֹמֵיָה** was intended. For **רָאָה** Is. 47, 10, **רָאָה** is to be read.—In the *participle passive* the 3rd radical still sometimes appears as **י** (§ 24. **ב**), comp. **עָשָׂה** *made*, Job 41, 25, **עָשָׂה** Job 15, 22, contracted from **עָשָׂה**; and before a formative ending, it even has its consonantal sound, **הַעֲשׂוּם** (read **הַעֲשׂוּם**) 2 Ki. 23, 4; **עֲשׂוּת** (read **עֲשׂוּת**) 1 Sam. 25, 18 **כְּעֲשׂוּת** (read **כְּעֲשׂוּת**) Is. 3, 16 **כְּעֲשׂוּת**. The shortening of the **י** in **רָאָה** Est. 2, 9 is irregular.

6. The defective writing is rare in such forms as **חִירָא** 2 Sam. 15, 33 (comp. **חִירָא** § 49. **חִירָא** 1 Ki. 8, 44, comp. 1 Ki. 9, 3; **חִירָא** Ex. 2, 16 (comp. Jer. 18, 21, 48, 6. 1 Chron. 7, 15. Job 17, 5 and elsewhere), and the pronunciation **חִירָא** Mic. 7, 10, comp. **חִירָא** Jud. 5, 29 (according to others *sing.* with *suff.* of the 3rd *sing. fem.*). Both cases must probably be explained according to § 20. **י**.

II. On Niph'al.

7. Here the forms with **י** in the 1st and 2nd *pers. sing.* of the *perfect* are those commonly in use (with **י** only in **נִפְּלִיָּה** Gen. 24, 8); on the other hand in the 1st *plur.* always **י**, as **נִפְּלִינוּ** 1 Sam. 14, 8. No examples of the 2nd *plur.* occur.—With **י** retained in *pause* **נִפְּלִיָּה** Num. 24, 6; once with an initial guttural **נִפְּלִיָּה** Cant. 1, 6 for **נִפְּלִיָּה**, probably arising from the ordinary strong form *niphru*, but the harshness of **פ** immediately followed by **ר** is avoided by pronouncing the **פ** with *Hateph-Pathah*.—In the 3rd *sing. fem.* **נִפְּלִיָּה** Prov. 27, 15 (in *pause* for **נִפְּלִיָּה**) and **נִפְּלִיָּה** may be transposed for euphonic reasons; but probably we should simply read **נִפְּלִיָּה**.

8. The *apocope* of the *imperfect* causes no further changes beyond the rejection **י** of the **י**, e. g. **יִנְּלִי** from **יִנְּלִי**; in one verb *middle guttural*, however, a form

occurs with the *Qameṣ* shortened to *Pathah*, viz. **יָפַח** (for **יָפַח**) Ps. 109, 13, as in verbs **עָנַע**; but in *pause* **יָפַח** in the same Psalm, verse 14. Comp. letter *bb*.—The *infinitive absolute* **יָפַח** emphasizing an *infinitive construct*, 2 Sam. 6, 20, is very extraordinary; probably it is a subsequent correction of an erroneous repetition of **יָפַח**.—On the *infinitive Niph'al* with syncope of the ה see § 51. l.—The irregular **תַּעֲלֶה** Ezek. 36, 3 has probably arisen from a combination of the readings **תַּעֲלֶה** (*Qal*) and **תַּעֲלֶה** (*Niph'al*). Similarly the solecism **יָבֹהֶה** 1 Sam. 15, 9 might be due to a combination of the *participle fem. Niph'al* (**יָבֹהֶה**) with the *Hoph'al* (**יָבֹהֶה**); but it is more correct, with Wellhausen, to explain the ה from a confusion with נָמַס and to read, in fact, **יָבֹהֶה וְנָמַסְתָּ**.

III. On *Pi'el*, *Pō'el*, *Pu'al*, and *Hithpa'el*.

g 9. In the 1st and 2nd persons of the *perfect Pi'el* the diphthong **יָ** in the second syllable is in most of the instances weakened to **יַ**, as **קָיָתִי**, **דָּמִיתִי**; always so in the first *plur.*, and before *suffixes*, e.g. **קָפִינִי** Gen. 37, 26, **דָּבִירָנִי** Ps. 44, 20. The form with **יָ** is found only in the 1st *sing.* (e.g. Joel 4, 21; Is. 8, 17 along with the form with **יַ**).—*Hithpa'el* has (besides **יָ** Jer. 17, 16) as a rule **יַ** (Prov. 24, 10. 1 Ki. 2, 26. Jer. 50, 24). On the other hand, *Pu'al* always has **יָ**, e.g. **עָשִׂיתִי** Ps. 139, 15.—A 1st *sing. perfect Pō'el* **עָשִׂיתִי** (= **עָשִׂיתִי**) occurs in Is. 10, 13.

aa 10. The *infinitive absolute Pi'el* takes the form **פָּעַל** (like **פָּעַל**, the more frequent form even in the strong verb, see § 52. o); with **δ** only in Ps. 40, 2 **פָּעַל**; with **δth**, Hab. 3, 13 **עָרַח** (comp. above, letter *n*). On **הוֹנֵה** and **הוֹרֵה**, *infinitives absolute* of the passive of *Qal*, not of *Pō'el*, see above, letter *n*.—As *infinitive construct* **פָּעַל** occurs in *Pi'el*, Hos. 6, 9 (only orthographically different from **פָּעַל**, if the text is correct); in *Pu'al* **עָוָח** Ps. 132, 1.

bb 11. The apocopated *imperfect* must (according to § 20. l) lose the *Dageš forte* of the second radical, hence **וְיָצִו** and *he commanded*, **תָּעַר** (for **תָּעַרָה** = *t'arrè*) Ps. 141, 8; comp. Gen. 24, 20; *Hithpa'el* **וְיִתְנַחֵל** and *he uncovered himself*, Gen. 9, 21; comp. Prov. 22, 24; comp. Ps. 37, 1. 7. 8. With the lengthening of *Pathah* to *Qameṣ*, **וְיָצַח** and *he made marks*, occurs in 1 Sam. 21, 14 (read, however, with Thenius **וְיָצַח**, and instead of the meaningless **וְיָצַח** in the same verse, **וְיָצַח**). In *Hithpa'el* **וְיִתְנַחֵר**, in close connexion, Deut. 2, 9. 19; **תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה** Is. 41, 10; according to Qimḥi also **וְיִתְנַחֵר** Ps. 45, 12. Prov. 23. 3. 6. 24, 1. 1 Chron. 11, 17, whilst Baer and Ginsburg read with the best authorities **וְיִתְנַחֵר** (comp., however, König, *Lehrgebäude*, i. p. 597)¹.—On **וְיִתְנַחֵר** Job 15, 17 (for **וְיִתְנַחֵר**) comp. § 20. m; on **וְיִתְנַחֵר** Ex. 33, 3, see § 27. q; on **וְיִרָד** Jud. 5, 13, see § 69. g. Finally, on **וְיִלֵּחַ**, which is referred to *Pi'el* by some, as a supposed *imperative*, see above, letter *n*.

cc 12. Examples of apocopated *imperatives* in *Pi'el* and *Hithpa'el* are: **צִו**, also **צִוָּה** *command thou*, **פָּחַ** *open thou*, Ps. 119, 18. 22; **כֶּן** *prepare thou*, Ps. 61, 8;

¹ In Num. 34, 7 sq., according to verse 10, **וְיִתְנַחֵר** (= **וְיִתְנַחֵר**) is intended to be read for **וְיִתְנַחֵר** (*imperfect Pi'el* from **נָחַר**).

נס for נסה *prove thou*, Dan. 1, 12; הִתְחַל *feign thyself sick*, 2 Sam. 13, 5; comp. Deut. 2, 24.—On רָבָה Jud. 9, 28, comp. § 48. *l.*—In Ps. 137, 7 עָרַד *raise it*, is found twice instead of עָרַד (for עָרַד) for rhythmical reasons (comp., however, וַעֲרַד in the *imperfect*, 2 Chron. 24, 11).

13. Examples of forms in which the *Yddh* is retained are the *imperfects* תִּרְמִיץ *dd* Is. 40, 18, comp. verse 25 and 46, 5; יִכְסִימוּ *they cover them*, Ex. 15, 5; *participle* Pu'al מְסַחֵם Is. 25, 6; for אֲרִיָּה Is. 16, 9 (from רָיָה) read with Stade, &c., אֲרִיָּה.

IV. On *Hiph'il* and *Hoph'al*.

14. In the *perfect Hiph'il* 3rd *sing.* *S^ghōl* is found in the first syllable *ee* as well as *ē* (§ 53. *p*), especially in הִנֵּלָה (but *perfect consecutive* הִנְלָה 2 Ki. 24, 14), הִרְאָה, הִלְאָה; also with *suffixes*, e. g. הִנְלָם 1 Chron. 8, 7. הִלְאֵנִי Job 16, 7, הִרְפְּדָה Ex. 21, 8. The *S^ghōl* also occurs in the 1st *sing.*, e. g. הִלְאֵתִי Mic. 6, 3. On הִרְאֵיתִי Nah. 3, 5, cf. § 53. *p*. The forms with *ē* in the second syllable (also written defectively, as הִרְבֵּיתִי Jer. 21, 6) are found throughout in the 1st *sing.* (except Prov. 5, 13), rarely in the 2nd *sing. masc.*, and never in the 1st *plur.* In the other persons they are about equally common with *ē*. Before *suffixes* the forms with *ē* (Gen. 18, 4, and elsewhere) predominate throughout as being somewhat shorter; comp., however, *ē* in Ex. 4, 12. Mic. 6, 3. Prov. 4, 11. In *Hoph'al* only יִּ occurs.

15. In the *infinitive Hiph'il* of רָבָה *to be abundant*, besides the *infinitive ff* *construct* הִרְבּוֹת we find the *absolute הִרְבָּה* taking the place of the common form הִרְבָּה, which came to be used invariably (but König calls attention to its use as *infinitive construct* in Ezek. 21, 20) as an adverb. in the sense of *much*; in 2 Sam. 14, 11 the *Q^{re}* requires הִרְבַּת for the *K^{athib}* הִרְבִּית, an evident scribal error for הִרְבּוֹת. Comp. Gen. 41, 49. 22, 17. Deut. 28, 63; the pointing הִרְבָּה Jer. 42, 2 perhaps arises from regarding this form as a noun.—On הִמְרוֹת Job 17, 2 (with *Dageš f. dirimens*) see § 20. *h*.—In 2 Ki. 3, 24 הִבּוֹת (before *h*) is probably *infinitive absolute*, used in order to avoid the hiatus, comp. § 113. *x*, and on a similar case in *Qal*, see above, letter *n*.—On the *infinitive* with syncope of הָ, comp. § 53. *q*.

16. The *shortened imperfect Hiph'il* either takes no helping vowel, as יִפְתָּ *gg* *let him enlarge*, Gen. 9, 27; יִדְדָּ *he shall subdue*, Is. 41, 2; וַיִּשְׁקַן *and he watered*, Gen. 29, 10, and elsewhere; וַיִּרְאָ *and he showed*, 2 Ki. 11, 4 (see § 28. *d*): or else has a helping vowel, as וַיִּגְלָ (for וַיִּגְלָ, see § 27. *r*), e. g. וַיִּגְלָ 2 Ki. 18, 11; וַיִּפְסַּר Ps. 105, 24; וַיִּחַרְעַז Ezek. 5, 6; וַיִּחַרְעַז 2 Chron. 33, 9; וַיִּאָרְבַּב i. e. probably וַיִּאָרְבַּב Jos. 24, 3 *K^{athib}* וַיִּאָרְבַּב (*Q^{re}*).—Examples of verbs *P^l* guttural: וַיִּעַל Num. 23, 2, וַיִּעַל &c., which can be distinguished as *Hiph'il* from the similar forms in *Qal* only by the sense.—The *apocopated imperative Hiph'il* always (except in verbs וַיִּפְסַּר, e. g. הִפְסַּר, § 76. *c*) has a helping vowel, *S^ghōl* or *Pathah*, e. g. הִרְבָּה *increase thou* (for הִרְבֵּה, הִרְבָּה) Ps. 51, 4 *Q^{re}*, also Jud. 20, 38, where, however, it cannot be explained with the context; הִרְבָּה *let alone* (for הִרְבֵּה, הִרְבָּה) Deut. 9, 14, and elsewhere; וַיִּעַל (for וַיִּעַל) Ex. 8, 1. 33, 12; but

for **הִשָּׁע** Ps. 39, 14, which could only be *imperative High'tl* of **שָׁעַע** (= *smear over*, as in Is. 6, 10), read with Baethgen **הִשָּׁע** *look away*.—The *imperfect High'tl* with *Yodh* retained occurs only in **הִנֵּינִי** Job 19, 2, from **נִי**. Comp. letter *u*.

V. In General.

hh 17. In Aramaic, where, as before remarked, verbs **לִי** and **לִי** form one class, the *imperfect* and *participle* of all the conjugations terminate in **לִי** or **לִי**. The Hebrew *infinitives*, *imperatives*, and *imperfects* in **לִי**, less frequently **לִי** or **לִי**, may be due to imitation of the Aramaic form. On the *infinitive construct* **פִּי'ל** **פִּי'ל**, see above, letter *aa*; *imperative Qal* **הִנֵּה** Job 37, 6 (in the sense of *fall*); *imperfect* **יִנֵּה** *let him look out*, Gen. 41, 33 (see, however, above, letter *p*); **יִעֲשֶׂה** *he will do*, Is. 64, 3; **אֵל-תְּהִיָּה** Jer. 17, 17; **אֵל-תִּבְרָא** *consent thou not*, Prov. 1, 10; **אֵל-תַּעֲשֶׂה** *do thou not*, 2 Sam. 13, 12 (the same form in Gen. 26, 29. Jos. 7, 9. Jer. 40, 16 *Qrē*); **אֶהְיֶה** (so Baer and Ginsburg, after cod. Hillel, &c.) *I will be*, Jer. 31, 1; **וַיַּעֲשֶׂה** Jos. 9, 24; **תִּבְרָא** Dan. 1, 13. Comp. also in *Niph'al* **יִפְעֶה** Lev. 5, 9; **תִּפְעֶה** (according to Qimhi) Num. 21, 17; in *Pi'el* **הִנְעֶה** Lev. 18, 7. 8. 12–17. 20, 19, in each case **לֹא תִנְעֶה**, beside **תִּנְעֶה** with a minor distinctive; **יִנְעֶה** (Baer, however, **יִנְעֶה** Nah. 1, 3; **יִנְעֶה** Ezek. 5, 12 (with *Zaqeph*; Baer **יִנְעֶה**). The fact, however, that a great number of these forms occur in *pause* and represent at the same time a *jussive* or *voluntative* (Jos. 7, 9), suggests the view that the long vowel may be used in order to increase the emphasis of the pausal form, and at the same time to make a distinction in sound between the *jussive* or *voluntative* and the ordinary *imperfect*¹. Elsewhere (Gen. 26, 29. Lev. 5, 9. Jer. 40, 16. Dan. 1, 13; according to Baer also Mic. 7, 10. Zech. 9, 5) the pronunciation with *ē* is probably intended to soften the hiatus caused by a following *N* or *Y*; comp. the analogous cases above, § 74. *l*.

ii The ending **לִי** appears to stand for **לִי** in the *imperfect Qal* in **וַתִּנְיֶשֶׁם** *and there hath she played the harlot*, Jer. 3, 6; perhaps, however, the 2nd *sing. fem.* is intended, or it may have been introduced into the text of Jeremiah from Ezek. 16, 15, &c. Still more strange is it in the *imperfect High'tl* **אֵל-תִּבְרָא** Jer. 18, 23; but the *Mil'el*-tone probably points to **תִּבְרָא** as the correct reading (comp. Neh. 13, 14). The **לִי** stands for **לִי** in the *perfect High'tl* **הִתְנַחֵל** *he*

¹ Possibly these examples (like the cases of *S'ghōl* in *pause*, letter *n*) represent the view of a particular Masoretic school, which was intended to be consistently carried out.—According to Praetorius (in *ZAW.* 1883, p. 25) traces of the (original) *jussive* of verbs **לִי** appear in the forms ending in **לִי**, and were already rightly recognized as such by Ewald, while on the other hand the apocopated mood of verbs **לִי** is quite a late (?) phenomenon, and simply the final result of actual biliteral forms, such as **יִנְעֶה**. According to this view, therefore, we cannot point to this mood in confirmation of the supposed tendency of the *jussive* to retract the tone, since in its origin it is altogether different from the *jussive*, although the language uses it in the sense of the *jussive*, which was becoming obsolete. Cf. also § 48. *g*, note.

made sick, Is. 53, 10, which is probably for חלל from חלל, a secondary form of חלה; see letter *rr*. The *plur.* המסין (Baer המסין) *they made to melt*, Jos. 14, 8, is a purely Aramaic form.

18. In three verbs the rare conjugation *Pa'lel* or its reflexive (§ 55. *d*) occurs: *kk* נאח¹ (in Ps. 93, 5 the Masora requires נאח), contracted to נאח *to be beautiful*, from נאח; מטח² Gen. 21, 16 *archers* (from טחח); but most frequently in שחח *to bend*, *Pa'lel* שתח³ not in use, whence reflexive השתחח *to bow oneself, to prostrate oneself*, 2nd pers. in ית⁴ and 1st pers. in יתי⁵, *imperfect* ישתחח⁶, *consecutive 3rd sing. masc.* וישתחח⁷ for wayyistahw (analogous to the noun-forms, like שחח for sahwh); 3rd plur. ישתחחו⁸.—Instead of the Aramaic *infinitive* with suffix בשהשתחחתי 2 Ki. 5, 18 read with König בשהשתחחתי; כשהשתחחתי Ezek. 8, 16 is still more certainly a scribal error for כשהשתחחתי.

19. Before *suffixes* in all forms ending in ה, a connecting vowel is employed *ll* instead of the ה and the vowel which precedes it (§ 58. *f*), e.g. נחני Gen. 24, 27; in *pause* ענני 1 Ki. 2, 30, &c., even with lesser disjunctives, Ps. 118, 5. Prov. 8, 22; or with a conjunctive accent, 1 Sam. 28, 15 (but Baer ענני), Job 30, 19; comp. § 59. *k*; ענני, in *pause* ענה, Is. 30, 19 (and even when not in *pause* Jer. 23, 37) or like ענה Deut. 32, 6; ירבד Gen. 28, 3; comp. also ענה, *imperfect* ענה, *hiph'al* הענה, *hiph'al* הענה, *hiph'al* הענה, *hiph'al* הענה.

Only very seldom does י take the place of the final ה or ה, e.g. *mm* אמאיהם Deut. 32, 26; יכפמי Ps. 140, 10 *Q'rt*; יכפמי *smile me*, 1 Ki. 20, 35. 37; comp. Hab. 3, 2. Is. 38, 16. In these examples, again, a return to the original ending *ay* might be assumed; but perhaps they are merely due to a less correct *plene* writing. In the 3rd sing. perf. fem. the older form נלת (see letter *z*) is always used before a *suffix*, e.g. בלתה (for בלתה) Zech. 5, 4; in *pause* עשתי Job 33, 4; יאתה 42, 5.

VI. The Relation between Verbs ל"ה and ל"ה.

20. The close relation existing between verbs ל"ה and ל"ה, which in Aramaic *nn* has resulted in a complete similarity, is shown in Hebrew by the fact that the verbs of one class often borrow forms from the other, especially in the later writers and the poets.

21. Thus there are forms of verbs ל"ה—(*a*) which have adopted the vowels *oo* of verbs ל"ה, e.g. perfect Qal בלאתי *I have refrained*, Ps. 119, 101; participle חוטא (*חטא*) *sinning*, Eccles. 2, 26. 8, 12. 9, 2. 18; comp. Is. 65, 20; מונה Eccles. 7, 26; נשא *lending*, 1 Sam. 22, 2; Pi'el perfect מלא he has filled, Jer. 51, 34; comp. 1 Ki. 9, 11. Amos 4, 2 (where, however, the perfect Niph. is perhaps intended), Ps. 89, 11. 143, 3; רפאתי *I heal*, 2 Ki. 2, 21; comp. Jer. 51, 9; imperfect ינפא Job 39, 24; Niph'al perfect נפלתה (like נפלתה) *it was wonderful*, 2 Sam. 1, 26; Hiph'al perfect הפלא Deut. 28, 59; הפלאה (in the *Textus*

¹ According to Buxtorf and others (comp. Nöldeke, ZDMG. xxx. 185) נאח is rather *Niph'al* from נאח.

receptus incorrectly אָהַרְה, comp. above, 2 Sam. 1, 26) *she hid*, Jos. 6, 17. On the other hand, forms like אָהַרְהִים 1 Sam. 14, 33, אָהַרְהִים Ps. 99, 6, אָהַרְהִים Ezek. 47, 8, אָהַרְהִים, according to the correct reading, Job 19, 2 (comp. Gen. 31, 39 אָהַרְהִים), and אָהַרְהִים imperative plur. masc. from אָהַרְה, Jos. 24, 14. 1 Sam. 12, 24. Ps. 34, 10, are due to the syncope of the *h*, see § 74. *i*. On אָהַרְהִים Jer. 10, 5 and אָהַרְהִים Ps. 139, 20, see § 23. *i*.

97 (b) Forms in ה, but with לִי pointing, e.g. *imperfect Qal* אָהַרְהִים Jer. 3, 22; *imperative* אָהַרְהִים *heal thou*, Ps. 60, 4; *Niph'al* אָהַרְהִים Jer. 49, 10 (which must evidently be a *perfect*; read with Ewald the *infinitive absolute* אָהַרְהִים as in verse 23), and אָהַרְהִים *to hide oneself*, 1 Ki. 22, 25, comp. Jer. 19, 11; *Pi'el* אָהַרְהִים *he will fill*, Job 8, 21.

99 (c) Forms entirely of a לִי character, e.g. *perfect Qal* אָהַרְהִים *and when thou art athirst*, Ruth 2, 9, comp. 2 Sam. 3, 8; אָהַרְהִים *they shut up*, 1 Sam. 6, 10; comp. 25, 33; אָהַרְהִים *they are full*, Ezek. 28, 16, comp. 39, 26; *infinitive* אָהַרְהִים (see above, letter *n*) *to sin*, Gen. 20, 6 (on מִלֵּאֵם see above, § 74, letter *h*); *imperative sing. fem.* אָהַרְהִים Is. 26, 20; *imperfect* אָהַרְהִים (for אָהַרְהִים) *he will keep back*, Gen. 23, 6; אָהַרְהִים *they heal*, Job 5, 18; *participle* אָהַרְהִים Prov. 12, 18; *fem.* אָהַרְהִים Eccles. 10, 5; *plur.* אָהַרְהִים Is. 29, 7; *participle passive* אָהַרְהִים Ps. 32, 1; *Niph'al* אָהַרְהִים Jer. 51, 9; אָהַרְהִים *thou hast prophesied*, Jer. 26, 9 (comp. Ps. 139, 14. Job 18, 3); *imperfect* אָהַרְהִים 2 Ki. 2, 22 (*infinitive* Jer. 19, 11); *Pi'el* *imperfect* אָהַרְהִים Jer. 8, 11, comp. Gen. 31, 39; *Hiph'il* *participle* אָהַרְהִים Ezek. 8, 3; *Hithpa'el* אָהַרְהִים 1 Sam. 10, 6; *infinitive* אָהַרְהִים 1 Sam. 10, 13. For the *K^{akhlh}* would have to be read אָהַרְהִים, with syncope of the *h* and retraction of the vowel.

22. On the other hand, there are forms of verbs לִי, which wholly or in part follow the analogy of verbs לִי, e.g. in their consonants אָהַרְהִים *he comes*, Is. 21, 12; אָהַרְהִים 2 Sam. 12, 17 (*Textus receptus* אָהַרְהִים); אָהַרְהִים Ezek. 43, 27; אָהַרְהִים Job 8, 11; אָהַרְהִים Lam. 4, 1; אָהַרְהִים 2 Chron. 16, 12; אָהַרְהִים Ex. 1, 10. Lev. 10, 19; אָהַרְהִים Deut. 28, 66 (comp. Hos. 11, 7); אָהַרְהִים (*infin. absol. Niph'al* beside אָהַרְהִים) 2 Sam. 1, 6; אָהַרְהִים 2 Ki. 25, 29; אָהַרְהִים Jer. 38, 4; אָהַרְהִים Eccles. 8, 1: in their vowels, אָהַרְהִים Jer. 3, 22; אָהַרְהִים Dan. 10, 14; אָהַרְהִים 1 Ki. 17, 14: in both, אָהַרְהִים Gen. 49, 1; comp. 42, 4. Is. 51, 19; אָהַרְהִים 2 Sam. 21, 12 *K^{akhlh}*; אָהַרְהִים 2 Chron. 26, 15 (comp. אָהַרְהִים המוראים 2 Sam. 11, 24 *K^{akhlh}*); אָהַרְהִים (*participle fem. Qal*) Zeph. 3, 1; אָהַרְהִים Hos. 13, 15; אָהַרְהִים Lam. 4, 2. For אָהַרְהִים (so Baer, Ezek. 17, 6, comp. 31, 8), which can only be intended for אָהַרְהִים as *participle fem. plur.* from אָהַרְהִים = אָהַרְהִים, read, according to Ezek. 31, 5, &c., אָהַרְהִים *branches*.

§ 76. Verbs Doubly Weak.

a 1. In a tolerably large number of verbs two radicals are weak letters, and are consequently affected by one or other of the anomalies already described. In cases where two anomalies might

occur, usage must teach whether one, or both, or neither of them, takes effect in the verb.

Thus e.g. from *נָדַד* to flee, the imperfect is *יָדוּד* in Nah. 3, 7 and *יָדַד* in Gen. 31, 40 (on the analogy of verbs *יָדַע*); *Hiph'il* *הִנְדַּד* (like a verb *יָעַע*), but the imperfect *Hoph'al* again *יָדַד* (as *יָדַע*).

2. The following are examples of difficult forms, which are derived *b* from doubly weak verbs:

(a) Verbs *יָדַע* and *לָיַד* (comp. § 66 and § 74), e.g. *נָשָׂא* to bear, imperative *שָׂא* (Ps. 10, 12 *נָשָׂא*, of which *נָסָא* Ps. 4, 7 is probably only an orthographic variation); *infinitive construct* *שָׂאתָ* (for *שָׂאתָ*; see the analogous noun-formations in § 93. f), also *נָשָׂא* Is. 1, 14. 18, 3; Gen. 4, 13 *נָשָׂא*; Ps. 89, 10 *שָׂא* (perhaps only a scribal error); after the prefix *ל* always *לְשָׂאתָ* (the contracted form only occurs in *מִשְׁתָּהוּ* Job 41, 17, with rejection of the *ל*); *imperfect* *תִּשְׂנֶה* for *תִּשְׂנֶה* Ruth 1, 14; wholly irregular are *תִּשְׂנֶה* Ezek. 23, 49 (so Baer after Qimhi; *Textus receptus*, and also the Mantua ed., and Ginsburg, *תִּשְׂנֶה*) and *נָשָׂאתָ* 2 Sam. 19, 43 as *infinitive absolute Niph'al* (on the analogy of the *infinitive construct Qal*?); most probably *נָשָׂא* is to be read, with Driver.

(b) Verbs *יָדַע* and *לָיַד* (comp. § 66 and § 75), as *נָטָה* to bow, to incline, *נָכָה* *c* to smite. Hence *imperfect Qal* *יִנָּח*, *apocopated* *יָנַח* (Gen. 26, 25 *יָנַח*) and *he bowed*; *יָנַח* (so, probably, also Is. 63, 3 for *יָנַח*) 2 Ki. 9, 33 and *there was sprinkled* (from *נָחַח*); *perfect Hiph'il* *הִנְכָּה* *he smote*, *imperfect* *יִנְכָּה*, *apocopated* *יָנַח*, *יָנַח* (even with *Athnah* 2 Ki. 15, 16; but also ten times *יִנְכָּה*) Deut. 2, 33; so also *יָנַח* Lev. 8, 11. 30; *אֶל־יָנַח* Ps. 141, 4 (comp. Job 23, 11); *imperative* *הִנְכָּה*, *apocopated* *יָנַח* *smite thou* (like *הִנְכָּה* *he incline*, with *הִנְכָּה*), *infinitive* *הִנְכּוֹת*, *participle* *נִכְּה*; *Hoph'al* *הִנְכָּה*, *participle* *נִכְּה*.

(c) Verbs *יָדַע* and *לָיַד* (comp. § 68 and § 75), as *מָאָה* *d* to bake, *מָאָה* to come. E.g. *imperfect Qal* *יִמָּאֵה*, *יִמָּאֵה*, *plur.* *יִמָּאוּ*; *יִמָּאֵה* (comp. § 68. h) Deut. 33, 21 *יִמָּאֵה* (= *יִמָּאֵה*); *imperfect apocopated* *יִמָּאֵה* Is. 41, 25 for *יִמָּאֵה*; *imperative* *אִמָּאֵה* Is. 21, 12. 56, 9. 12 (comp. *אִמָּאֵה* *bake ye*, Ex. 16, 23) for *יִמָּאֵה* (*יִמָּאֵה*) (§ 23. h; § 75. u); *Hiph'il perfect* *הִמָּאֵה* for *הִמָּאֵה* (*הִמָּאֵה*) Is. 21, 14; *imperfect apocopated* *יִמָּאֵה* and *he adjured*, 1 Sam. 14, 24, properly *יִמָּאֵה* (*יִמָּאֵה*) from *יִמָּאֵה*, whence *יִמָּאֵה*, and, with the obscuring to *θ*, *יִמָּאֵה*; instead of the simple *apocope* (*יִמָּאֵה*) the *ל* which had already become quiescent, is made audible again by the helping *S^ghöl* (unless perhaps there is a confusion with the *imperfect consecutive Hiph'il* of *יִמָּאֵה*).

(d) Verbs *יָדַע* and *לָיַד* (comp. § 69, § 70, and § 74), as *יָצָא* to go forth, *e* *imperative* *יָצֵא* go forth, with *ה* *paragogic* *יָצֵאָה* Jud. 9, 29 in principal pause for *יָצֵא*; and *fem. plur.* *יָצֵאָה* Cant. 3, 11; *infinitive* *יָצֵאתָ*; *Hiph'il* *הוֹצֵא* to bring forth.—*יָרָא* to fear, *imperfect* *יִירָא* and *יִירָא* (or *יִירָא*), *imperative* *יָרָא*; *imperfect Niph'al* *יִירָא* Ps. 130, 4, *participle* *נוֹרָא*.

(e) Verbs *יָדַע* and *לָיַד* (comp. § 69, § 70, and § 75), e.g. *יָדָה* to throw, *f*

Hiph'il to *confess*, to *praise*, and ירה to *throw* (both properly verbs ע' and פ'), and יפה to *be beautiful*. Infinitive ירה, ירות; imperative ירה; imperfect consecutive ויפה Ezek. 31, 7 (comp. also ויפיו 16, 13); with suffixes ויפיו we have shot at them (from ירה) Num. 21, 30; perhaps, however, it should be read with the LXX ויפיו and their race (also in Ps. 74, 8 נים is probably a substantive, and not the imperfect Qal with suffix from ינה); Pi'el וידו for וידו (§ 69. u). Hiph'il הורה, הורה; infinitive הורת (as infinitive absolute 2 Chron. 7, 3), הורת, imperfect הורה, comp. אל-הנו Jer. 22, 3; apocopated ויר 2 Ki. 13, 17.

g (f) Verbs ע' and ל', particularly בוא to *come*. Perfect בא, באת, באת, or באת (Gen. 16, 8. 2 Sam. 14, 3. Mic. 4, 10; comp. § 75. m), once באת for באת 1 Sam. 25, 8; for בא Jer. 27, 18, which is apparently the perfect, read בא. In the imperfect Qal the separating vowel occurs (באת) instead of the more common באת, comp. also באת Gen. 30, 38 only in Jer. 9, 16. Pa. 45, 16 and 1 Sam. 10, 7 K^{thibb}.

h For ותבאת 1 Sam. 25, 34 Q^{rel} (the K^{thibb} ותבאתי evidently combines the two readings ותבאת and ותבאת; cf. Nestle, ZAW. 14, p. 319), read ותבאת; on the impossible forms Dent. 33, 16 and Job 22, 21 comp. § 48. d. In the perfect Hiph'il הביא, הביאת and (only before a suffix) הביאת; the latter form is also certainly intended in Num. 14, 31, where the Masora requires והביאתי, comp. 2 Ki. 9, 2. 19, 25. Is. 43, 23. Jer. 25, 13. Cant. 3, 4. Before suffixes the ē of the first syllable in the 3rd sing. always becomes Hataf-Sghol, e.g. הביאתי, הביאתי; elsewhere invariably Hataf-Pathah, e.g. הביאתני or הביאתני. On the other hand, ē is retained in the secondary tone in the perfect consecutive when without suffixes, e.g. והביאת. Cf., moreover, והקאתו in Opitius and Hahn is altogether incorrect), Prov. 25, 16, from קי; but קי spue ye, Jer. 25, 27 (perhaps only a mistake for קי), is not to be referred to קי but to a secondary stem קי. In the imperfect והקא is found once, Lev. 18, 25, besides וקא (analogous to וקא).—On אבי (for אבי), יני, יני, see § 74. k.

i (g) The verb חי to *live*, in the perfect Qal, besides the ordinary development to חי (fem. חייה), is also treated as a verb ע', and then has the form חי in the 3rd pers. perfect, in pause חי, and with wāw consecutive וחי Gen. 3, 22, and frequently. In Lev. 25, 36 even the contraction to חי occurs in the perfect consecutive. The form חי stands in Ex. 1, 16 in pause for חי (3rd fem.) with Dages omitted on account of the pausal lengthening of ā to ā.

§ 77. Relation of the Weak Verbs to one another.

a The close relation which exists between some classes of the weak verbs (e.g. between ע' and פ', ל' and ל', ע' and ע', ע' and ע') appears not only from their similarity or identity of inflexion, or their mutual interchange of certain forms, but especially from the fact that frequently the same root (*radix bilittera*, see § 30. g) recurs in

various weak stems of similar meaning. The meaning accordingly is inherent in the two constant root-consonants, while the third consonant, which is weak (and the particular class of weak verbs with it), does not establish any difference in the meaning. Thus from the root ךף there occur with the same meaning ךף , ךף , ךף to strike, to crush; and from the root נר — נר , נר , נר to flee.

In this manner the following classes are related in form and *b* meaning:

1. Verbs ע'ע and ע'ע in which the first and third consonants are the same in both, as being essential to the meaning; e.g. מף and מף to become poor; מף and מף to feel; נר and נר to flee.
2. Verbs ע'ע and ע'ע ; e.g. נצב and נצב to place, נקש and נקש (*yāqōš*) to lay *c* snares. Moreover, stems belonging to the classes mentioned in 1. (especially ע'ע) are frequently related also to verbs ע'ע and ע'ע , e.g. נר and נר to fear; מכ and מכ to be good; נפח and נפח to blow; נפץ and נפץ to dash to pieces. Verbs ע'ע are less frequently connected with these classes, e.g. אשם and אשם to be destroyed, אשם and אשם to thresh, &c.
3. Verbs ע'ע and ע'ע (in which the first two consonants form the real body *d* of the stem) are sometimes related to each other, and sometimes to the above classes. To each other, in ךף and ךף to crush, קרא and קרא to meet (comp. § 75, letter *nn*); to verbs of the other classes, in מצה and מצה to suck, דחף and דחף to thrust, &c.

§ 78. Verba Defectiva.

It often happens, when two kindred weak verbs are in use with *a* the same meaning that both are defective, i.e. do not occur in all the forms. Since, however, those tenses and forms which are not in use in the one verb are generally supplied by the other, they mutually complete one another, and thus form together, as it were, an entire verb, as in Greek *ἐρχομαι*, aor. *ἦλθον*, fut. *ἐλεύσομαι*, and in Latin *fero*, *tuli*, *latum*, *ferre*, &c., but with this difference, that in Hebrew the roots of these verbs are almost always closely related.

The most common verbs of this kind are—

בוש to be ashamed. *Hiph'il* הביש (inferred from הביש), but also הביש , הביש , as if from ביש , on the analogy of verbs ע'ע ; also in Is. 30, 5 the *Q'el* requires הביש , where the *K'thth* has הביש from ביש .

טוב to be good. *Perfect* טוב ; but *imperfect* יטב and *Hiph'il* היטיב from טב (comp., however, היטיב 2 Ki. 10, 30).

ינר to be afraid. *Imperfect* ינר (from נר).

יָעַץ to *awake*, only in the *imperf.* יָעִץ; for the *perfect*, the *Hiph'il* הָעִץ is used (from עָץ).

נָפַץ to *break in pieces*. *Imperfect* יִפְּץ (from פָּץ). *Imperative* פֹּץ. *Niph'al* נִפְּץ. *Pi'el* נִפְּץ (from נָפַץ). *Pi'el* פֹּצֵץ (from פָּץ). *Reflexive* הִתְפַּצֵּץ. *Hiph'il* הִפְּץ. Also פִּצְּץ Job 16, 12.

נָצַב (*Qal* in post-biblical Hebrew, in Aramaic and Arabic) to *place*, whence (possibly) *Niph'al* נִצַּב and *Hiph'il* הִנְצִיב (see above, § 71); but *Hithpa'el* הִתְנַצַּב. *Qal* שָׁתָה to *drink*, used in *Qal*; but in *Hiph.* הִשְׁתָּה to *give to drink*, from a *Qal* שָׁתָה which is not used in Hebrew.

On הָלַךְ (הָלַךְ) to *go*, see above, § 69. x.

- c Rem. 1. To the same category belong also, to a certain extent, those cases where the *tenses* or *moods* not in use in one conjugation, are supplied by forms having the same meaning in other conjugations of the same verb. Thus:

יָסַף to *add*. The *infinitive* (comp., however, § 69. h, note) and *imperfect*, unused in *Qal*, are supplied by the *Hiph'il* הוֹסִיף, יוֹסִיף (on יוֹסִיף as *imperfect indicative*, see § 109. d, and cf. also § 109. f).

הִשְׁטִיף to *stumble*. *Perfect* from *Qal*, *imperfect* from *Niph'al*.

נִגַּשׁ to *approach*, unused in *perf.* *Qal*, instead of which *Niph'al* נִגַּשׁ is used; but *imperfect* נִגַּשׁ, *imperative* נִגַּשׁ, and *infinitive* מִנִּגַּשׁ from *Qal* only are in use.

הִנְחִיף to *lead*. *Perfect* usually הִנְחִיף in *Qal*, so *imperative* הִנְחִיף, but *imperfect* and *infinitive* always in *Hiph'il*.

נָתַךְ to *be poured out*. *Perfect* *Niph'al* נִתְּךְ with *imperfect* *Qal* נִתְּךְ, while the *perfect* *Qal* and *imperfect* *Niph'al* are not in use.

- d 2. The early grammarians often speak of *mixed forms* (*formae mixtae*), i. e. forms in which are united the supposed character and meaning of two different tenses, genders or conjugations. Most of the examples adduced are at once set aside by accurate grammatical analysis; some others appear to have arisen from misapprehension and inaccuracy, especially from erroneous views of unusual *plene* forms. Others, again, are either merely wrong readings or represent an erroneous, though often intentional, combination of two different readings.

CHAPTER III.

THE NOUN.

§ 79. General View.

For the literature, see De Lagarde, *Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina*, Göttingen, 1889; Index and Additions, 1891; J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, first half, *the simple nouns*, Leipzig, 1889; second half, *nouns with external additions*, 1891; second edition, with indices of words and subjects, 1894; E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude*, &c., ii. 1, Leipzig, 1895, see above, § 3. f.—Of these three important works the first two especially have given rise to various articles. In support of De Lagarde: Hommel in *ZDMG.* xliv. p. 535 sqq. (against De Lagarde and Hommel: Barth, *ibid.*, p. 679 sqq.), and dealing with the Index, *ZDMG.* xlv. p. 340 sqq.—Against Barth (though with many points of agreement): Philippi in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*, 1890, p. 344 sqq. (answered by Barth in *ZDMG.* xlv. p. 692 sqq.), and *ZDMG.* xlv. p. 149 sqq. (answered again by Barth, *ibid.* xlviii. p. 10 sqq.), also in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, ii. 1892, p. 359 sqq. 'Die semitische Verbal- und Nominalbildung in ihrem Verhältnisse zu einander,' and lastly, in *ZDMG.* xlix. p. 187 sqq.—Cf. also A. Müller, 'Semitische Nomina. Bemerkungen zu de Lagarde und Barth,' *ZDMG.* xlv. p. 221 sqq.—The main points at issue in the works of De Lagarde and Barth are indicated below, § 83. d.

1. Since, according to § 30. a, most word-stems are developed *a* into verbal stems as well as into noun-stems, it has become customary (especially in the *Lexicon*) to trace back the noun to the most simple ground-form of the verbal formation, viz. the *3rd pers. sing. perfect Qal*, and, as it were, to derive it from that form. This is usual, not only in those noun-stems which can be directly classified with a corresponding verbal stem (*Nomina verbalia* or *derivativa*, § 83 sqq.), but also with *Nomina primitiva*, i. e. those of which no verbal stem is now found in Hebrew (see § 82), as well as finally with *Nomina denominativa*, which have evidently been derived from other nouns (§ 86).

The adjective agrees in form entirely with the substantive. On the formation of adjectival ideas by giving to abstracts a concrete sense, see § 83. c.

- b* 2. Strictly speaking, the inflexion of the noun to express the various cases does not exist in Hebrew; in fact, hardly more than a few ancient and almost extinct traces of case-endings have survived (§ 90). The syntactical relation of a noun can therefore in general only be inferred from its position in the sentence, or from its being joined to prepositions. In either case, the form of the noun undergoes no change (except for the *construct state*, § 89), and the representation of case-relations belongs therefore almost exclusively to the syntax (§ 117 sqq.). The comparative and superlative of adjectives also can be expressed only by a syntactical combination (§ 133). On the other hand, several changes in the forms of nouns are occasioned by the additions of the plural, dual and feminine terminations, as well as of the pronominal suffixes, and also by the close connexion of two nouns, by means of the *construct state*¹.

§ 80. The Indication of Gender in Nouns.

- a* 1. The Hebrew, like all Semitic languages, recognizes only two genders in the noun, a *masculine* and a *feminine*. Inanimate objects or things, and abstract ideas, which other languages sometimes indicate by the *neuter*, are regarded in Hebrew either as masculine or feminine, more often the latter (see the Syntax, § 122. *q*).
- b* 2. The *masculine*, as being the more common and important gender, has no special indication. The feminine had originally the ending ָ , as in the 3rd *sing. perfect* of verbs (§ 44. *a*). This ָ , however, is regularly retained only in close connexion with a following genitive or suffix (cf. § 89. *e* and § 91. *o*), except where the form has arisen through the addition of a simple ָ (see below, letter *d*). Otherwise, the feminine ending of the independent form (the *absolute state*, § 89. *a*) is—
- c* (a) Most commonly a tone-bearing ָ , e. g. סוּס *equus*, סוּסָה *equa*. Of nouns ending in ָ , like עֶבֶר, the feminine (by § 24. *b*) is עֵבֶרָה, cf. § 86. *h*. As in the 3rd *sing. fem. perfect* (הִקְטִילָהּ &c.), this ָ has arisen by the rejection of the final ָ , and the lengthening of the *a* in the open syllable, whereupon the ָ was added as an orthographic

¹ To speak of these changes as a declension of the Hebrew noun, as is usually done, is accordingly incorrect.

indication of the final long vowel: comp. the exactly similar origin of such forms as *גִּלָּה* for *גִּלָּה*, § 75. c:

(b) Simple *ת* with nouns ending in a vowel, e.g. *יְהוּדִי Jew, יְהוּדִית Jewess*. The same ending *ת* is very frequently added to stems ending in a consonant, but only (except before suffixes) by means of a helping vowel, which, as a rule, is *Seghol*, but after gutturals *Pathah*, e.g. *כָּטַל fem. כָּטַלָּה, killing*; before suffixes, e.g. *חֶסֶדְךָ according to the rule given in § 69. c, comp. also § 84 a, letter s; מוֹדַע an acquaintance, fem. מוֹדַעַת*. The forms which arise in this way follow in every respect the analogy of the *segholate* forms (§ 94. f). The forms which have been developed by means of a helping vowel are used even for the connective form (*construct state*); except *יֹלְדָה* (for *יֹלְדָת*, which is used elsewhere) Gen. 16, 11. Jud. 13, 5. 7; comp. Jer. 22, 23 and 51, 13 *Qʿrē*, also *מְשַׁרְתָּ* 1 Ki. 1, 15, *participle fem. Pi'el*, contracted from *māsaratt = מְשַׁרְתָּת*; also *מְבַעֲרָתָּ* (*participle fem. Pi'el* with suffix) arises from the form *מְבַעֲרַת* contracted from *מְבַעֲרַתָּת*.

Rem. 1. The fem. form in *תָּ* is in general less frequent, and occurs almost exclusively when the form in *תָּ* is also in use. It is only in the participles and infinitives that it is the commoner, e.g. *כָּטַלָּה* more common than *כָּטַלָּה*, *לָדַת* than *לָדָה*.

2. Rarer feminine endings are—(a) *תָּ* with the tone, viz. *בְּרָקָתָּ emerald, f* Ezek. 28, 13 (also *בְּרָקָתָּ* Ex. 28, 17); *שְׂפָטָתָּ a company, 2 Ki. 9, 17*, unless the reading is wrong; more frequently in proper names, especially of places among the Canaanites or Phoenicians (in whose language *תָּ* was the usual fem. ending, § 2. d) and other neighbouring tribes¹, e.g. *צָרְפָּתָּ Sarepta, גִּבְעָתָּ Gib'ath, קִירְיָתָּ Qiryath, אֵילָתָּ Greek Ailana in Idumea; אֶחָתָּ Gen. 26, 26: on the reading אֵילָתָּ cf. letter g. Comp. moreover, מַחְלָתָּ Ps. 53, 1. 88, 1; נְיִינָתָּ Ps. 61, 1 (prob. originally נְיִינָתָּ); חֵיתָּ (LXX חֵיתָּ) 74, 19 a; מִינָתָּ Lam. 2, 18; רַבָּתָּ much, in Ps. 65, 10. 120, 6. 123, 4. 129, 1. 2, is a form borrowed from the Aramaic (Syriac *rabbath*) in which the original *t* of the *fem.* is often retained to form adverbs, see Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 135.]*

(b) *תָּ*, which likewise occurs in some names of places, e.g. *חֶלְקָתָּ, בְּעֵלָתָּ g* as well as in the *mas.* proper name *חֶלְקִיתָּ* 1 Sam. 17, 4, &c. (in 17, 23, and 21, 10, ed. Mant. has *חֶלְקִיתָּ*), and in the *fem.* proper name *שְׂמִיעָתָּ*; otherwise, almost

¹ *מְשַׁרְתָּתָּ* Mal. 1, 14 (so e.g. the Mantua ed.), might stand for *מְשַׁרְתָּתָּ* as *participle fem. Hoph'al*; but *מְשַׁרְתָּתָּ* (so Baer and Ginsburg) is also supported by good authority.

² Comp. the *Mêla* stone, line 3, *זאת הבמת this high place*; line 26, *המסלת the highway*; [see also Driver, *Tenses*, § 181, note.]

only in poetry, viz. **זמרת** Ex. 15, 2. Is. 12, 2. Ps. 118, 14 (for **זמרת** *my song*; the absorption of the *f*, however, can scarcely have 'taken place in the Aramaic manner,' as suggested by Duham on Is. 12, 2, nor is it due merely to the following *Yddk*, but is intended 'to facilitate the absorption of *י*;' so Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 277 sq.); **נחלת** *heritage*, Ps. 16, 6 (either again for **נחלתי** *my heritage*, or for **נחלתה**, comp. § 90. g, as probably also **עזרת** *help*, Ps. 60, 13. 108, 13). Comp. also **פורת** *fecunda* (a fruitful tree) Gen. 49, 22; **יתרת** *abundance*, Jer. 48, 36 (before *ע*; but in Is. 15, 7 **יתרת**); **שנת** *sleep* (for **שנה**) Ps. 132, 4; and in prose **קמח** *pelican* (which reading is also preferable, in Is. 34, 11, to the form **קמח**), also **מחרת** *the morrow*, but in *construct state* always **מחרתי**.—**תהלת** Jer. 49, 25 *Q^{re}* is no doubt intended to indicate the reading **תהלת**, parallel to **משלי**; comp. above, on **זמרת** &c.

h (c) **א** the Aramaic orthography for **ה**, chiefly in the later writers; **זר** *loathing*, Num. 11, 20; **חמא** *a terror*, Is. 19, 17; **שנת** *sleep*, Ps. 127, 2; **לביא** *a lioness*, Ezek. 19, 2 (unless **לביא** is intended); **מאר** *a mark*, Lam. 3, 12; cf. also **דשן** *threshing* (*participle Qal* from **דש**) Jer. 50, 11; **מר** *bitter*, Ruth 1, 20. On the other hand, according to the western Masora, **קרח** *baldness* is to be read in Ezek. 27, 31; see Baer on the passage.

i (d) **ה**, an obtuse form of **ה** (§ 27. u), only in **זרה** for **זרה** Is. 59, 5; comp. **לנה** for **לנה** Zech. 5, 4; **אנה** i Ki. 2, 36. 42 (§ 90. i, and § 48. d).

k (e) **ה** without the tone, e.g. **חמה** Deut. 14, 17 [Lev. 11, 18 **חם**]; **חמה** *an oven heated*, Hos. 7, 4; comp. Ex. 28, 19. Ezek. 7, 25. 40, 19. 2 Ki. 15, 29. In all these examples the usual tone-bearing **ה** is probably intended, but the Punctuators, who considered the feminine ending inappropriate, produced a kind of *locative* form (see § 90. c) by the retraction of the tone. [In 2 Ki. 16, 18. Is. 24, 19. Ezek. 21, 31 (note in each case the following **ה**), as also in Job 42, 13, the text is probably in error.]

l (f) **ה**, as an old feminine termination, preserved also in Syriac (*af*), in Arabic and (contracted to *el*) in Ethiopic, very probably occurs in the proper name **שרי**, cf. Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. p. 183; also **עשרה** *ten* (*fem.*) probably arises from an original *'esray*; so Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 138; König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 427.

m 3. It is wholly incorrect to regard the vowel-ending **ה** as the original termination of the feminine, and the consonantal ending **ת** as derived from it. The Ethiopic still has the **ת** throughout, so too the Assyrian (*at*, *it*); in Phoenician also the feminines end for the most part in **ת**, which is pronounced

¹ In 1 Sam. 20, 27 also, where the Masora (see Baer on Jos. 5, 11) for some unknown reason requires **מחרת**, read with ed. Mant., Jablonski, Opatius, and Ginsburg, **מחרת**.

² In this ending the **ה** can only be considered consonantal in the sense that the **ת** was originally aspirated, and afterwards 'the mute **ת** was dropped before **ה**, just as the old Persian *mithra* became in modern Persian *mīhr*;' so Socin, who also points to the Arabic pausal form in *ah*, and observes that among some of the modern Bedwān an *h* is still heard as a fem. ending. In Hebrew this consonantal termination was entirely abandoned, at any rate in later times.

at in the words found in Greek and Latin authors; less frequently in א (see Gesenii, *Monum. Phoen.*, pp. 439, 440; Schröder, *Phön. Sprache*, p. 169 sqq.). The ancient Arabic has the obtuse vowel ending scarcely anywhere but in *pause*; in modern Arabic the relation between the two endings is very much as in Hebrew.

§ 81. Derivation of Nouns.

Nouns are by their derivation either ^(a) *primitive*, i. e. cannot be *a* connected with any verbal stem at present extant (see § 82), such as אב father, אם mother (but see both words in the Lexicon; according to Stade and others אב, אם, &c., are children's words and terms of endearment, and so really primitive nouns), or ^(b) *derivative*, i. e. either *Derivativa verbalia* (§§ 83–85) in the sense indicated above in § 30. *a* and § 79. *a*, e. g. רם high, רמה high place, מרומ height, from רם to be high, or less frequently *Derivativa denominativa* (§ 86), e. g. מקוֹלֹת the place at the feet, from קָלַל foot.

Rem. 1. The earlier grammarians consider the verb alone as stem and, therefore, *all* nouns as verbals, dividing them into (a) *Formae nudaæ*, i. e. such as have only the *three* (or *two*) radicals, and (b) *Formas auctas*, such as have formative letters or syllables added at the beginning or end, e. g. מַלְכֻּת, מַלְכָּה. The formative letters used for this purpose are ו י נ ט ס נ ת י ו¹, and the treatment of nouns formerly followed this order.

According to the view of *roots* and *stems* presented in § 30. *d*, nouns (other than *c* *denominatives*) are derived not from the verbal stem, but either from the (abstract) root or from the still undefined stem. In the following pages, however, the arrangement according to the verbal stem is retained as being simpler for the beginner. Comp. § 79. *a*.

2. *Compound* nouns as *appellatives* are very rare in Hebrew, e. g. בְּלִיעַל worth- *d* lessness, baseness. On the other hand, they very frequently occur as proper names, e. g. גְּבִרְיָאֵל (man of God), יְהוֹרִיָּם (Yahwe raises up), יְהוֹרִיָּה (Yahwe strengthens), &c.²

§ 82. Primitive Nouns.

The number of *primitive* nouns in the sense used in § 81 is small, since those nouns, which in other languages are represented as independent noun-stems, can easily be traced back in Hebrew to the

¹ From this *vox memorialis* the *nomina aucta* are also called by the older grammarians *nomina heemantica*.

² G. Rammelt (*Über die zusammengesetzten Nomina im Hebr.*, Halle, 1883, and Leipzig, 1884) recognizes as appellatives only צַפְרִידָע (comp. below, § 85. *w*) and צִלְמֻת (the latter certainly incorrectly [see, however, Nöldeke, *ZATW.* 1897, p. 183 sqq.]). In p. 8 sqq. the author gives a list of 'logical compounds,' i. e. new terms formed by composition with the negatives לֹא, בְּלִי, מְבִלִי.

verbal idea, e.g. names of animals and natural objects, as שְׂעִיר *he-goat* (prop. *shaggy*, from שָׁעַר), שְׂעִירָה *barley* (prop. *prickly*, also from שָׁעַר), חֲסִידָה *stork* (prop. *pia*, sc. *avis*), זָהָב *gold* (from זָהַב = צָהַב *to shine, to be yellow*). Thus there remain only a few nouns, e.g. several names of members of the body in men or beasts, to which a corresponding verbal stem cannot be assigned at all, or at any rate only indirectly (from other Semitic dialects), e.g. קֶרֶן *horn*, עֵינַי *eye*.

§ 83. Verbal Nouns in General.

- a* 1. In Hebrew, as in Greek and Latin, the *verbal nouns* are connected in form and meaning primarily with certain forms of the verb, especially the participles and infinitives, which are themselves, even in their ordinary form, frequently used precisely like nouns, e.g. אֹיֵב *enemy*, יָדַעַת *to know, knowledge*. Still oftener, however, certain forms of the infinitive and participle, which are seldom or never found as such in the strong verb, though in use in the weak verb and in the kindred dialects, came to be commonly used for the verbal noun; e.g. the participial form קָטַל, the infinitives of the (Aramaic) form קָטַל (as a *noun* also קָטַל), further קָטַלָה, קָטַלְהָ, קָטַלְהָ (§ 45. *d*), &c. Others (as the Arabic shows) are properly intensive forms of the participle.
- b* 2. As regards their meaning, it follows from the nature of the case that nouns which have the form of the infinitive regularly denote the action or state, with other closely related ideas, and are therefore mostly abstract; while the participial nouns, on the contrary, denote for the most part the subject of the action or state, and are therefore concrete. Moreover, it is to be noticed, that a particular meaning is attached to many of the special forms of derivative nouns, although it does not appear equally in them all.
- c* Rem. It need not appear strange, when we consider the analogy of other languages, that a noun which in form is properly *abstract* afterwards acquired a *concrete* sense, and vice versa. So in English, we say *his acquaintance*, for the *persons with whom he is acquainted*; the *Godhead* for *God himself*; in Hebrew מוֹדָעַת *acquaintance* and *an acquaintance*.
- d* The inner connexion in thought between Semitic noun-forms and the corresponding verbal forms is investigated in the works of De Lagarde and Barth (see the titles at the head of § 79) on very different lines, but with many points of agreement. De Lagarde starts from the fact that language consists of sentences. The sentence which consists of only *one* word, is called a verb, and

anything which serves as a complement to it, is a noun. The oldest form of the sentence is the imperative. Closely related to it are three kinds of sentences of the nature of verbal forms, differing according as the property of the particular object of sense is to be represented as invariable (form *qatula*), or as liable to change (form *qatila*), or, finally, as a circumstance which takes place before our eyes (form *qatala*). Like the imperative, these three forms of sentences have also been transformed into nouns, by means of certain phonetic changes,—especially by the omission of the final vowels and the addition of different terminations to the last consonant of the stem. But just as the forms of the verbal sentence undergo numerous modifications (in the tenses, moods, and conjugations), so also do the nouns, sometimes by assimilation of the unessential to the characteristic vowel (*qutul*, *qitil*), sometimes by the lengthening of the characteristic vowel (*qatûl*, *qatîl*, *qatâl*), or else through the displacement of the accent and the consequent reduction of the noun to a monosyllabic form (*qatl*, *qull*, *qill*), or, finally, by their being formed from the derived stems (or conjugations), e. g. *qattal*, *qattâl*; *qittil*, *qittâl*, &c. Further modifications arise from the use of the various imperfect and infinitive-forms, and also from the employment of the prefix *m*. Lastly, *denominalia* are formed from *deverbalia* by appending certain suffixes.

De Lagarde does not, however, claim to be able to show in the case of each particular noun the sense it conveyed in primitive times; the origin of a number of nouns can now no longer be detected. In those, however, which are clearly derived from verbs, the original meaning is chiefly determined by the characteristic vowel.

Barth's system is based on the thesis that 'all Semitic nouns, adjectives, and participles are derived from either the perfect or the imperfect stem.' Thus, e. g. קָטַל is the infinitive of the perfect stem, קָטַל the infinitive of the imperfect stem, קָטַל infinitive of קָטַל , &c. In dissyllabic noun-forms the second vowel is always alone characteristic and essential, the first vowel unessential, and therefore variable. Further modifications of the simple form are effected by strengthening (sharpening) the second or third consonant, by lengthening the characteristic vowel (instead of which, however, the feminine termination may also be used), or by 'metaplasm,' i. e. by the use of noun-forms derived from one of the two intransitive stems for the other, e. g. *qutl* for *qitl*, and vice versa.

In nouns of the perfect stem, the vowels *i* and *u* indicate intransitive formations, the vowel *a* a transitive sense. In nouns of the imperfect stem on the contrary, *u* and *i*, being characteristic vowels, indicate a transitive and *a* an intransitive sense: for *yaqtûlû* is imperfect of the transitive perfect *qatala*, and *yaqtîlû* imperfect of the intransitive perfects *qatila* and *qatula*, &c. This explains how nouns apparently identical in form, may yet in sense belong to different classes: a *qutl*-form from a *u*-imperfect has a transitive meaning, but the same form from a *u*-perfect has an intransitive meaning. This double system of perfect and imperfect forms runs through the whole scheme of noun-formation, not only the forms connected with the conjugations, but also the forms with prefixes and suffixes.

Against the whole theory it has been urged that it subjects the development of the language to a much too abstract mechanism, and further, that the meanings of words as we find them may in many cases be due to a perversion of the original sense. But though many of the details (e. g. the alleged unessential

character of the vowel of the first syllable) remain doubtful, yet the agreement between the characteristic vowel of certain noun formations and that of the perfect or imperfect stem, is supported by such a number of incontestable instances, that there can be no doubt as to a regular, intimate connexion between the two. At the same time it must be admitted that De Lagarde has put forward many important and suggestive points, and both scholars agree in laying stress on *one* characteristic vowel as indicative of the meaning.

§ 84 a. Nouns derived from the Simple Stem.

a Preliminary remark.—From the statement made above, § 83. *d*, it follows that an external similarity between forms is no proof of their similar origin, and, vice versa, external difference does not exclude the possibility of their being closely related both in origin and meaning.

I. Nouns with One Vowel originally Short.

1. Nouns with one of the three short vowels after the first radical, ground-form

✓ *qāḏl, qūḏl, qūḏl.*

The supposition of *monosyllabic* ground-forms was rendered necessary by the character of forms now existing in Hebrew, as well as in Arabic, &c. But there are various reasons for believing that originally a toneless *ā* was heard after the second radical. The corresponding *qāḏl*-forms in Assyrian (v. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gramm.* p. 157 sq.), with the case-ending, are *kalbu*, *šamsu*, *abnu* (= *קָלָבּ, שָׁמֶשׁ, אָבִן*), but without the case-ending, *kalab*, *šamas*, *aban*. In Delitzsch's opinion the vowel is only sounded after the second radical in order to avoid the double consonant at the end. The *plurals* of the Hebrew segholates however (see § 92. *e* and § 93. *d*) and the forms mentioned below, letter *e*, point rather to the ground-forms *mālak*, *sīphar*, *qūdaš*; cf. Philippi, *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleich. sem. Sprachwissenschaft*, ii. 372 sqq.—The explanation, formerly adopted also in this Grammar, of *qāḏl*-forms as originally *qāḏl-l*-forms (cf. De Lagarde, *Obersicht*, p. 72 sqq.) is supported by the Arabic *mālik* (rarely *malik*), and still more by *qāḏl*, *qūḏl*, *qūḏl*, the connective forms of *qāḏl*, &c., from ground-forms *gāḏl*, *yāḏl*, *kāḏl*. Even so the *a* of the plural *מַלְכִּים* remains as before, unexplained. The same objection applies equally to deriving at least *some* of the segholates from original monosyllabic forms, corresponding to the Arabic infinitives *qatl*, *qūl*, *quḏl*, unless it be assumed that their plurals have been affected by the analogy of the (more numerous) forms with *ā* in the second syllable.

1. (a) From the strong stem the above three ground-forms are further developed to *קָטַל, קָטַל, קָטַל* (comp. § 27. *r* and in § 93 the explanations of Paradigm I, *a-c*); added a helping vowel (§ 28. *d*) *קָטַל truth*. If the second or third radical be a guttural, a helping *Pathah* takes the place of the helping *Seghol*,

¹ It is worthy of notice that St. Jerome also (cf. Siegfried, *ZAW.* iv. 76) frequently represents the vowel of the first syllable by *a*, e.g. *gader*, *aben*, *ader*, *areb*, for *גָּדַר, אָבִן, אָדַר, תָּרַב*, but *cedem*, *secel*, *deber*, &c., for *סָדַם, סֶסֶל, דִּבֵּר*, &c.

according to § 22. *d*, e.g. זָרַע *seed*, נֶצַח *eternity*, מַעַל *work*; but, with middle ה or ח, also חֶמֶס *bread*, חָח (as well as רֶחֶם) *womb*, אֹהֶל *tent*, אֶמְתָּן *thumb*; so with final א, פָּרָא *a wild ass*, &c.; with a middle guttural also the modification of the principal vowel *d* to *è* does not occur, e.g. זָעַר, רָהַב (exceptions, again, לָחַץ, נָעַר, רָהַב). On the inflexion, comp. § 93, Paradigm I, *a-f*, and the explanations. In חַטָּא *sin*, the א has wholly lost its consonantal value.

Examples of feminines: מַלְכָּה (directly from the ground-form *malak, king*), סִתְרָה *a covering* (also סִתָּר), אֹכֶלָה *food* (also אֹכֵל); with a middle guttural נַעֲרָה *girl*, טָהֳרָה *purity* (also טָהָר). Comp. § 94. Paradigm I.

(*b*) From weak stems: (*a*) from stems ע'ן, e.g. אָף *nose* (from 'anp, hence with formative additions, e.g. אֶפְי for 'anpī, *my nose*); עֵז *a she-goat* (ground-form 'Inz), fem. חֶמְדָּה *wheat*; (*β*) from stems ע'ע (§ 93, Paradigm I, *l-n*); פֶּחַ *a morsel*, עַם *people* (so, when in close connexion with the next word; unconnected עָם; with article הָעָם, לָעָם, &c.); רַב in the sense of *much*, but רַב *great, numerous* (also in close connexion with רַב); רָע *evil*, with the article in close connexion הָרָע, unconnected הָרַע (on the various vocalization of עָם, רַב, רָע, see further in Stade, *Grammatik*, § 193. *b*); with the *d* always lengthened to *ā*, יָם *sea*; fem. חַיָּה *life*, and with attenuation of the *d* to *l*, מִידָּה *measure*; from the ground-form qūl, אִמָּה *mother*, fem. מִידָּה *a shearing*; from the ground-form qūl, חֹק *statute*, fem. חֻקָּה. (*γ*) from stems ע'י (Paradigm I, *g* and *è*); מָוֶת *death* (from md-ut, the *u* passing into the corresponding consonant, as in חֲמִידָה *middle*) or contracted יוֹם *day*, שׁוֹט *whip*, שׂוֹר *a bull*; fem. עֲוִלָּה *perverseness* (also contracted עוֹלָה); from the ground-form qūl, צֶדֶק *a rock*, fem. סִיפָה *a storm*. (*δ*) from stems ע'י (Paradigm I, *k*); יֵית *an olive-tree* (with a helping Hīreq instead of a helping S^ghōl) from sd-it, the *i* passing into the corresponding consonant; or contracted חֶסֶם *bosom*, חֵיל Kl. 18, 17 (elsewhere חֵיל) *host*; fem. שֵׁיבָה *grey hair*; from the ground-form qūl, דִּין *judgement*, fem. בִּינָה *understanding*. (*e*) from stems ל'ה (Paradigm I, *k*); partly forms such as מִבְּכָה *weeping*, מִמְּרָה *murmuring*, נִרְחָה *a present*, קֶצֶה *the end*, partly such as אֲרִי *a lion* (ground-form bāhy, 'dry); comp. also the forms from stems originally ל'י שָׁחַ *swimming* (ground-form sdhw); fem. שְׁלֵחָה *rest*, נִאֲחָה *exaltation*; from stems ל'י אֲלִיָּה *a fat tail*, and with attenuation of *d* to *l* שְׁבִיָּה *captivity*, also נִשְׁבִּית, formed directly from the masc. נִשְׁבִּי with the fem. termination ית; from the ground-form qūl, חֲצִי (from hīcy); fem. חֲרוּהָ *joy*, עֲרִיָּה and עֲרִיָּה *nakedness*; from the ground-form qūl, בָּרָה (from bāhw); דָּלִי, for דָּלִי, *bucket*; fem. אֲנִיָּה *a ship* (directly from אֲנִי *a fleet*).

The masculines as well as the feminines of these *segholate* forms may have either an abstract or a concrete meaning. In the form קָטַל the *passive* or at any rate the *abstract* meaning is by far the more common (e.g. נְעָר *youthfulness*, abstract of נָעַר; אֹכֵל *food*, &c.).

2. Nouns with one of the three short vowels under the second radical (present ground-form q'īl, q'īll, q'īl), e.g. דְּבַשׁ *honey*, דִּי *sickness*, תַּחַת *terror*; and so always with middle א, בָּאֵר *a well*, זָאב *a wolf*, בָּאֵשׁ *stench*. In reality these

forms, like the segholates mentioned in No. 1 (see above, letter *a*), are, probably, for the most part to be referred to original dissyllabic forms, but the tone has been shifted from its original place (the penultima) on to the ultima. Thus *dibbāṣ* (originally *dibbaṣ*) as ground-form of דִּבְּשׁ is supported both by the Hebrew דִּבְּשׁ (with suffix of the first person), and by the Arabic *dibs*, the principal form; *bi'ir* (according to Philippi with assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first) as ground-form of בִּיאַר is attested by the Arabic *bi'r*; for בִּיאַשׁ (Arabic *bu's*) similarly a ground-form *bu'āṣ* may be inferred, just as a ground-form *qūlūl* underlies the infinitives of the form קָטַל¹.

II. Nouns with an original Short Vowel in both Syllables.

- f* 3. The ground-form *qāṭūl*, fem. *qāṭūlāt*, develops in Hebrew to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *a, b*) and קָטְלָה (§§ 94, 95, Paradigm II, *a, b*), mostly adjectives, as חָכֵם *wise*, חָרָשׁ *new*, יָשָׁר *upright*; but also substantives, as דָּבָר *a word*, and even abstracts, as אָשָׁם *guilt*, רָעָב *hunger*, שָׂבֵעַ *satiety*; in the fem. frequently abstract, as צִדְקָה² *righteousness*; with an initial guttural אֶרֶץ *earth*.—Of the same formation from verbs עָנָה *alone*, עָנָן *cloud*: passive חָלַל *pierced*.—In verbs לִיחַ the final *Yōdh* is almost always rejected, and the *ā* of the second syllable lengthened to *ē*. Thus שָׂרִי *field*, after rejection of the *y* and addition of ה as a vowel-letter, becomes שָׂרָה (comp. § 93, Paradigm II, *f*); fem., e.g. יָפָה (masc. יָפָה *beautiful*); comp. § 95, Paradigm II, *c*. From a verb לִיחַ the strong form עָנָה *afflicted*, occurs.
- g* 4. The ground-form *qāṭīl*, fem. *qāṭīlāt*, developed to קָטַל (§ 93, Paradigm II, *c-e*) and קָטְלָה, is frequently used as participle of verbs middle *e* (§ 50. *b*), and hence mostly with an intransitive meaning; comp. נָקֵן *old, an old man*; כָּבֵד *heavy*; fem. בָּהֵמָה *cattle*, אֲפֵלָה *darkness* and הַשְׁכָּה *darkness*, probably also אֵימָה *terror* if it be contracted from אֵימָה.—From verbs מָחָה: מָחָה *heat*, שָׁנָה *sleep*. Irregular, דְּלִיחוֹת *the branches of it*, Jer. 11, 16, &c., generally referred to a *sing.* דְּלִיחַ (stem, דָּלַח), and הַרְיוֹתֵינוּ Hos. 14, 1 *their women with child* (from הָרָה, *st. constr.* הָרָה, *plur. st. absol. and constr.* הָרָה).—From a verb לִיחַ with consonantal Wāw: שָׁלוֹ *at ease*, incorrectly written *plane* שָׁלוֹ Job 21, 23.
- h* 5. The ground-form *qāṭūl*, developed to קָטַל (also written קָטַל), generally forms adjectives, e.g. אָיִם *terrible*, בָּרֵד *piebald*, סָתוּק *sweet*, נֶקֶד *speckled*, עֲבַת *interwoven*, עָגֹל *round*, עָמֵק *deep*, עֵקֶב *hilly*, צָהָב *golden*; קָטַן *small*, only in

¹ On this theory cf. Stade, *Hebräische Grammatik*, § 199. *b*; De Lagarde, *Übersicht*, p. 57 sq.; A. Müller, *ZDMG*. xlv. p. 226, and especially Philippi, *ZDMG*. xlix. p. 208.

² In St. Jerome's time these forms were still pronounced *ṣadaca* (צִדְקָה), *ṣaaca* (צִדְקָה), *nabala* (נִבְלָה), &c., see Siegfried, *ZAW*. iv. 79. Moreover, the numerous abstracts of this form (e.g. even קִצְצָה *a splintering*, צִוּחָה *a crying*, &c.) are undoubtedly to be regarded (with Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 87) as feminines of infinitives of the form *qāṭūl*, the lengthening of the second syllable being balanced, as in other cases, by the addition of the feminine termination.

sing. masc., with a parallel form קָטָן of the class treated under letter *f*, fem. קַטְנָה, plur. קַטְנִים. These forms are not to be confounded with those in No. III, from the ground-form *qāṭāl*.—Fem. אִיפָּה, פְּבוּדָה (*glorious*), עֲבָתָה, עֲנָנָה (*delicate*), עֲנָלָה, עֲמָקָה, with sharpening of the third radical, in order to keep the original *ā* short, and, similarly, in the plurals פְּרָדִים, נְקָדִים, עֲנָלִים, סְטָרִים *stores*, &c.

6. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to קָטַל (comp. § 93, Paradigm II, Rem. 1), *i* e.g. לֵבָב *heart*, עֵנָב *a bunch of grapes*, יִמְזִית *temētum*; from a verb ל'ח, probably of this class is רֵעָה, generally contracted to רֵעַ, *friend*, ground-form *ri'ay*: the full form is preserved in רֵעֵהוּ *his friend*, for רֵעִיהוּ.

III. *Nouns with an original Short Vowel in the First and a Long Vowel in the Second Syllable.*

7. The ground-form *qāṭāl* in Hebrew always develops to the form קָטַל, *k* the *ā* becoming an obscure *ō*. The fact that this form is also written קָטַל must not lead to the confusion of these forms with those mentioned in No. 5, from the ground-form *qāṭāl*¹. Comp. גָּדוֹל *great*, קָדוֹשׁ *holy*, קָטַם *oppressing*; also the *infinitives absolute* of the form קָטַל (§ 45. *a*) as representing the abstract idea of the verb, and abstract substantives like פְּבוּדָה *honour*, שָׁלוֹם *peace* (Arab. *sālam*); also in an active sense, as אֲמֹנָה *an architect*, בֹּחֵן *assayer* (of metals), עֹשֶׂה *an oppressor*; fem. גְּדוּלָה (with the change of the short vowel to vocal *ṣwā*, while in גָּדוֹל, &c., *before the tone* it is lengthened to *ā*; פְּבוּדָה *treacherous* (fem.) Jer. 3, 7. 10, with irregular retention of the *ā* in the third syllable from the end.

8. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to קָטַל (comp. § 93, Paradigm IV, *a* and *b*), *l* e.g. אֲסִיר *a prisoner*, מְשִׁיחַ *an anointed one*; besides the passive it has also the intransitive sense (probably as a simple strengthening of the *qāṭāl*-form), e.g. צָעִיר *small*, and even the active, e.g. נְבִיא *a speaker* (prophet), מְפַקֵּד *an overseer*.—From verbs ל'י: נָקִי *pure*, עָנִי *poor*, see § 93. *vv*. Of a different kind again (according to De Lagarde, infinitives) are אֲסִיף *the ingathering*, בְּצִיר *vintage*, חֲרִישׁ *ploughing time*, קָצִיר *harvest*. On *qāṭāl*-forms with a kindred meaning, cf. § 84 *b*, letter *f*.

9. The ground-form *qāṭāl* develops to קָטַל. Of this class are all the passive *m* participles of *Qal*, and (probably as a strengthening of the *qāṭāl*-form) some stative adjectives (§ 50. *f*), like אֲנִיחַ *incurable*, עָצִים *strong*, עָרִים *subtil*; as substantives, e.g. דֹּבֶשׁ *a fowler*. Fem., e.g. בְּרוּיָה *virgo* (prop. *the secluded*). Further, some of the forms mentioned in § 84 *b*, letter *g*, belong to this class; see above, the remark on letter *l*.

10. The ground-form *qāṭāl* or *qūṭāl* in Hebrew changes the *t* to vocal *ṣwā*, *n* and develops to קָטַל (comp. § 93, Paradigm IV, *c*) or קָטוֹל, with *ā* obscured to *ō* (as above, letter *k*). Comp. שְׂאֵר *remnant*, יָקָר *honour*, סֵפֶר *book* (Arab. *kitāb*), קָרַב *war* (the last three probably loan-words from the Aramaic); of the

¹ In Nah. 1, 3 only the *Q^{er}* requires גָּדֹל (in the constr. state) for the *K^{ethib}* גָּדוֹל.

other form, חֶלֶם *a dream*, חֲמֹר *an ass* (Arab. *ḥimār*), אֱלֹהִים *God* (Arab. *'ilāh*); with *N* prosthetic (§ 19. *m*), אֶרֶץ *arm* (twice: usually אֶרְצָה); fem. בְּשׂוּרָה *good news* (Arab. *bišārāt*); עֲבוּדָה *service*, בְּחָבְתָה *tattooing*.

- o 11. The ground-form *qīlāl* seems to occur, e.g. in Hebrew אֲוִיל *foolish*, אֲוִל *vanity*, בְּרִיל *lead*, בְּסִיל *a fool*, חֲוִיר *a swine* (the prop. name חֲוִיר points to the ground-form *qīlāl*, comp. Arab. *ḥīnstr*).

- p 12. The ground-form *qīlāl* or *qūlāl*, Hebr. קִטּוֹל e.g. גְּבוּל *a boundary*, לְבוּשׁ *a garment*; fem. גְּבוּרָה *strength*, אֱמֻנָה *faithfulness*.

- q Rem. When the forms *qīlāl* and *qūlāl* begin with *N*, they almost invariably take in the singular, instead of the ordinary *Ḥateph-S-ghōl*, a *Ṣere* under the *N*; comp. אִכּוֹס *a crib*, אֶמְוִן *thread*, אֱמֻנָה *faithful*, אֶזְזֹב *hyssop*, אֶזְזֹר *a waist-band*, אֶסֹר *a bond*, אֶפְדֹר *an 'ephod'*; comp. § 23. *h*, and the analogous cases of *Ṣere* for *Ḥateph-S-ghōl* in verbal forms § 52. *m*, § 63. *p*, § 76. *d*.

IV. Nouns with a Long Vowel in the First Syllable and originally a Short Vowel in the Second Syllable.

- r 13. The ground-form *qūlāl*, in Hebrew, always changes the *ā* into an obscure *ō* קֹטֵל (קָטֵל), e.g. עוֹלָם (§ 93, Paradigm III, *a*), Arab. *ʿālam*, *eternity*; חוֹתָם (Arab. *ḥālam*) *a seal* (according to Barth rather of Egyptian origin), fem. חוֹתָם (from *ḥōlām*); תוֹלָע *worm* (unless from a stem וֹלַע, like תוֹשֵׁב from וֹשַׁב; see the analogous cases in § 85. *δ*). On the participles *Qal* of verbs לִיחַ (comp. § 93, Paradigm III, *c*), formerly referred to this class, cf. § 75. *e*; on the feminines of the participles *Qal*, which are formed with ת of the fem., see below, letter *s*.

Rem. Of a different kind (probably from a ground-form *qauṣal*) are such forms as אוֹפֵן (or אִפֵּן Ezek. 10, 9 in the same verse) *a wheel*; נוֹף *a young bird*, נֶנֶץ *wax*, &c.

- s 14. The ground-form *qūlāl* also becomes in Hebrew almost invariably קֹטֵל (קָטֵל). Besides *participles active masc. Qal* this class includes also feminines of the form קָטֵלָה, if their ground-form *qūlāl* (§ 69. *c*) goes back to an original *qūlāl*. The substantives of this form, such as כֹּהֵן *priest* (Arab. *ḥākim*), were also originally participles *Qal*. The fem. of the substantives has *ē* (lengthened from *r*) retained before the tone, e.g. יֹלְדָה *a woman in travail* (comp. also בֹּנֵדָה *the treacherous woman*, Jer. 3, 8; הַלְלֵהָ *her that halbeth*, Mic. 4, 6 sq., Zeph. 3, 19; כֹּחֵדָה *a buckler*, Ps. 91, 4); the participles as a rule have the form יֹלְדָה, &c., the original *r* having become *S-wā*; however, the form with *Ṣere* occurs also in the latter, Is. 29, 6. 8. 34, 9. Ps. 68, 26. 118, 16 (all in principal *pause*; in subordinate *pause* 2 Sam. 13, 20. Is. 33, 14; with a conjunctive accent, Cant. 1, 6).

- t 15. The ground-form *qūlāl*, Hebrew קִטּוֹל (as יִבְלֵ *river*, Jer. 17, 8) or קִטּוֹל, e.g. עֶנְבִּי *a pipe*, commonly עֶנֶב, and to be so read, with Baer, also in Ps. 150, 4, not עֶנֶב.

V. Nouns with Long Vowels in both Syllables.

- u 16. קִטּוֹל, e.g. קִטּוֹר *smoke*. The few forms of this kind are probably derived from the ground-form *qīlāl* (*qīlāl*?), i.e. the original *ā* has become an obscure *ō*.

§ 84 b. *Formation of Nouns from the Intensive Stem.*

This includes all forms which have arisen, either through the *a* doubling of the middle radical, or the repetition of one or of two consonants of the simple stem.

VI. *Nouns with the Middle Consonant sharpened.*

As in the corresponding verbal stems (comp. § 52. f), so also in some noun-formations of this class, the Dages in the second radical expresses an intensification of the idea of the stem, either emphasizing the energy of the action or relation, or else indicating a longer continuance of the relation or condition. Other nouns of this character are evidently only by-forms of the nouns derived from the simple stem, which were treated in the last section: cf. the instances adduced under letters *f* and *g*, and Barth, *Nominalbildung*, Introd. p. xi.

17. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in Hebrew (except in infinitives *Pi'zēl*, like שָׁחַח, &c.), *b* is mostly lengthened to קָטַל; comp. אָגַל *a stag*, fem. אֵילָה, constr. st. אֵילָת (from 'āyyāl); comp. also the fem. (originating from *Qal*) הָלָה *a flame* (according to § 27. *q* for lāhhābhā), חֲרָבָה *dry land* (for ḥarrābhā), דָּבַחַת and קָרַחַת *a burning fever*, יָבֵשָׁה and יָבֵשֶׁת *dry land*, טָבַעַת *a seal-ring*, שָׁחַפַת *consumption*. Adjectives of this class ('intensified participles of the active verb,' Barth, *ibid.*, § 33) are נָגַח *went to gore*, כָּנַח *jealous*, כָּחַשׁ (for kahhāš, by § 22. *c*) *lying*. *Nomina opificum* also, curiously enough, are so treated in Hebrew (at least in the constr. state of the sing.), although the corresponding Arabic form *qāṭṭāl* points to an original (unchangeable) *ā* in the second syllable; comp. נָגַב *a thief*, דָּיַן *a judge* (constr. st. דִּין Ps. 68, 6), טָבַח *a cook*, חָרַשׁ (for ḥarrāš) *faber* (constr. st. חָרַשׁ, but in the plur. חָרָשִׁי); פָּרַשׁ *horseman* (for parrāš), constr. st. פָּרָשׁ Ezek. 26, 10.

18. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl* appears in נָחַח *dry*, נָאָה *haughty* (the *ā* being *c* lengthened to *ē* according to § 22. *c*), if these forms go back to original *stāhhāy*. *gl'ād*. On the analogy, however, of the adjectives denoting defects (see letter *d* below), we should rather expect a ground-form *qāṭṭāl*; moreover, *iurwalt*, ground-form of the fem. אֵילָת *foolishness*, goes back to an original *iurwill*, see § 69. *c*.

19. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*; comp. the fem. כָּסַחַת *spell*.

20. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*; as אָחַר *alius*; from the intensive stem, the *d* infinitives *Pi'zēl* of the form קָטַל.

21. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in Hebrew lengthened to קָטַל. Of this form are a considerable number of adjectives which denote a bodily or mental fault or defect. Comp. אָמַר *disabled*, אָמַם *dumb*, גָּבַן *hump-backed*, עִוֵּר *blind*, חָרַשׁ *deaf* (for ḥirrēš), פֹּסֵחַ *lame*, קָרַח *bald*, עָקַשׁ *perverse*; פָּחַח *open-eyed* follows the same analogy.

22. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, comp. the remarks in letter *b* above, on the *e* *Nomina opificum*; moreover, to this class belong infinitives *Pi'zēl* of the Aramaic form מְקַרְה *a searching out*; מְקַרְשָׁה *a request*; with middle guttural (see § 22. *c*) נִאָצָה *contumely*, but cf. also נִאָצוּתִי Ezek. 35, 12, with full lengthening of the original *ā* before *N*; נְחֻמָּה *comfort*. From the attenuation of the *ā* of this form to *ē*, arises undoubtedly:

23. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, e. g. אָבִיר *husbandman* (Arab. 'akbār).

24. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, most probably only a variety of the form *qāṭṭāl* with the *ā* attenuated to *i* (as in No. 23), and the *ā* obscured to *o* (as in letters *n* and *r*); comp. גָּבֹר *hero* (Arab. gabbār), יָפוֹר *caviller*, צִפּוֹר (*piper* or *chirper*) a *bird*, שָׁכֹר *drunkard*. On the other hand יָלוֹד *born* probably arises from *yullōd*, an old *participle passive* of *Qal*, the *ā* being dissimilated in the sharpened syllable before *o*: so Barth, *ibid.*, p. 41 sq.

f 25. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, קָטִיל, almost exclusively of persons, who possess some quality in an intensive manner, e. g. אָבִיר *strong*, צַדִּיק *righteous*, בָּרִיחַ *fugitive* (for *barryḥ*), עָרִיץ *violent* (for 'arrīṣ).

That some of these are only by-forms of the *qāṭṭāl*-class (see above, remark on letter *a*), appears from the *constr. st.* פָּרִיץ *ravenous*, Is. 35, 9 (but פָּרִיצִים always), and according to Barth (*ibid.* 35. *a*) also from the *constr. st.* אָבִיר (but cf. also אָבִיר 1 Sam. 21, 8) of אָבִיר. However, the form אָבִיר, as a name of God, may be intentionally differentiated from אָבִיר, a poetic term for the bull.

In the same way אָסִיר *prisoner*, סָרִיס *eunuch* (*constr. st.* always סָרִיס, plur. סָרִיסִים, *constr. st.* סָרִיסִי Gen. 40, 7, but in the book of Esther always סָרִיסִי, with *suffix* always סָרִיסִיו, &c.), and עִתִּיק *weaned*, may be regarded as by-forms of the *qāṭṭāl*-class with passive meaning, see § 84 *a*, letter *l*.

g 26. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, קָטֹל, e. g. חַנּוּן *gracious*, רַחוּם *full of compassion* (with virtual doubling of the ח), חָרִיץ *diligent* (for *harrāṣ*), probably, again, to a large extent by-forms of the *qāṭṭāl*-class, § 84 *a*, letter *m*. The same applies to substantives like אֶשֶׁר *a step* (in אֶשְׁרִי, as well as אֶשְׁרִי, &c.), עֲמֹד *pillar*; fem. חֲבִירָה *a stripe* (also חֲבִירָתוֹ *security*: cf. Barth, *ibid.*, § 84).

h 27. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*; besides the infinitives absolute *Pi'zēl* of the form קָטַל, also קָנָא *jealous* (as well as קָנָא, consequently an obscure form of *qāṭṭāl*, letter *e*).

i 28. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, קָטַל, e. g. צָפוּי *a coating of metal*, שְׁלֹם *requital*, שָׁקַי *drink*, שָׁקֵץ *detestable thing*; with concrete meaning לָמוֹד *a disciple*, עָזָז *strong*; frequently in the plural in an abstract sense, as גְּדוּפִים *reproach*, מְלֵאִים *filling* (the induction of a priest), נְחֻמִּים *consolations, compassion*, שְׁבֵלִים *a childless state*, שְׁלָחִים *dismissal*, שְׁמוּרִים *observance*.

VII. Nouns with the Third Consonant repeated.

k 29. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, e. g. שָׁאֵן *quiet*, fem. שְׂאֵנָה (with sharpening of the second *Nūn*, in order to keep the preceding vowel short); רֶעֶן *green*, plur. רֶעֶנִּים.

l 30. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in Hebrew קָטַל; of this form are e. g. the infinitives *Pi'zēl* (prop. *Pa'zēl*) of verbs *Y'ē*, as רוּמָם, comp. § 72. *m*.

m 31. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*; so the plur. גְּבָנִים *ridges* (with sharpening of the *Nūn*, as in No. 29).

32. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in פָּרָחַח *a brood*.

33. The ground-form *qāṭṭāl*, in אָמֵל *saint*.

34. The ground-form *qāṭlāl*, e.g. שַׁמְרִים עֲבִימִים *plunder*, סִנְרִיר *heavy rain*, שִׁפְרִיר *glittering tapestry*, Jer. 43, 10 *Q^{re}*; with attenuation of the *ā* to *i* מְרִירִים *all that maketh black*, Job 3, 5.

35. The ground-form *qāṭlāl*, e.g. שִׁמְרִיר Jer. 43, 10 *Kth*.; נְאֻפִּים *adulteries*.

VIII. Nouns with the Second and Third Consonants repeated.

36-39. *qāṭlāl*, *qāṭlāl*, *qāṭlāl*, *qāṭlāl* (in fem. and plur. often with *ti* the last consonant sharpened for the reason given in letter *a* above); comp. הַמְכָּפֶּה *flexuosus*, חֲלָקָה *slippery places*, עֲקֻלָּה *crooked (ways)*; comp. הַמְכָּפֶּה *perversus*; also words denoting colours, אֲדָמָה (Lev. 13, 42. 49 in pause) *reddish*, fem. יְפִיפָה, plur. אֲדָמָה, plur. יְקִרָה *greenish*, plur. fem. יְקִרָה, *qāṭlāl*, plur. יְפִיפָה *very fair* (to be read in Jer. 46, 20 for יְפִיפָה); *qāṭlāl*, plur. שְׁחִירָה (fem.) *blackish*; *qāṭlāl* *a rabble* (augmented from אָסַף *collected*). From a verb *ʿ* with aphaeresis of the initial syllable צִאצָּאִים *offspring*. Moreover, of the same form, probably, are הַצִּצְרָה *a trumpet* (for הַצִּצְרָה, comp. § 55. *c*) and פִּתְחָה *an opening*, Is. 61, 1. Also in Is. 2, 20 לְחַפְרָה *is to be read instead of לְחַפֵּר* (from the *sing.* חָפַר *a digging or burrowing animal, perhaps the mole*).

IX. Nouns in which the Whole (Bilateral) Stem is repeated.

Naturally this class includes only isolated forms of the stems ע"ע and ע"י. *o*
Thus:—

40. גִּלְגָּל *a wheel*, and, with attenuation of the first *ā* to *i*, גִּלְגָּל (from גִּלְגָּל); fem. חֲלִילָה *anguish* (from חִיל or חִיל); נֶכֶד (for *kirkar*) *a talent*; comp. also בֹּכֶב *a star* (from *kāwkeb*, Arabic *kaukeb*, for בִּכְבֵּב).

41. פִּלְפֵּל infin. *Pilpēl* (prop. *Palpēl*) from פִּל; fem. מְלִילָה *a hurling* *ḥ* (from מִל).

42. כִּדְכִד perhaps *a ruby* (for *kādkād*), from כִּד.

43. קִדְקִד *the crown of the head* (for *qādqād*), from קִד; fem. גִּלְגִּלָּה *a skull* (for *gālgūl*), from גִּלְגָּל.

44. גִּירָה *girded*, from גִּיר; בִּקְבֵּק *a bottle*, from בִּקָּק.

§ 85. Nouns with Preformatives and Affirmatives.

These include nouns which are directly derived from verbal forms *a* having preformatives (*Hiph'il*, *Hoph'al*, *Hithpa'el*, *Niph'al*, &c.), as well as those which are formed with other preformatives (א, י, מ, נ, ת), and finally those which are formed with affirmatives. The quadriliterals and quinqueliterals also are taken in connexion with these formations, inasmuch as they arise almost always by the addition or insertion of one or two consonants to the triliteral stem.

¹ On פִּיפִי see § 96 under פִּי.

X. Nouns with Preformatives.

b 45. Nouns with א prefixed. Comp. the substantives with א prosthetic (§ 19. m), such as אֶרֶץ *arm* (Jer. 32, 21. Job 31, 22; elsewhere always אֶרֶץ *a finger*, אֶרֶב *a locust*, אֶרֶץ *fist*. In these examples the א is a 'euphonic' prefix (Barth, *ibid.*, § 150. *b*); in other cases it is 'essential': cf. especially the adjectives, אֶבֶן *deceitful*, אֶבֶן *cruel*, אֶבֶן *perennis* (for 'aitan') [= the Arab. 'elative,' used for expressing the compar. and superl. degrees]. The fem. אֶבֶן *fragrant part* (of the meal-offering) is a *nomen verbale* of *Hiph'il*, answering to the Aramaic infinitive of the causal stem ('Aph'el).

c 46. Nouns with ה prefixed. Besides the ordinary infinitives of *Hiph'il* הִקְטִיל and הִקְטִיל, of *Niph'al* הִקְטִיל, (for *hinq.*), and of the conjugations formed with the prefix הִתְ, this class also includes some rare *nomina verbalia* derived from *Hiph'il* (cf. § 72. *a*), viz. הִפְרָה *appearance* (from *hpr.*), Is. 3, 9; הִנָּפָה *a swinging* (from *hnp.*), Is. 30, 28; הִנָּחָה *a rest-giving*, Est. 2, 18; הִנָּחָה *deliverance* (from *hnc.*), Est. 4, 14 (an Aram. form: cf. הִנָּחָה Dan. 5, 20); perhaps also הִיבֵל *palace*, from *haikdl*, unless it be a foreign word from the Assyrian; see the Lexicon.

d 47. Nouns with י prefixed, as יָדָה *oil*, יָלָט *wallet*, יָנָשָׁה *owl* (!); from verbs יָצָע, e.g. יָצָח *a living thing*, יָתָר *a range*; from a verb יָרִיב *an adversary*. Of a different character are the many proper names which have simply adopted the imperfect form, as יָעֻקֵּב, יָחֻס, &c.

e 48. Nouns with מ prefixed. This *preformative Mēm*, which is no doubt connected with מִי *who*, and מַה *what* (see § 37 and § 52. *c*), appears in a very large number of nouns, and serves to express the most varied modifications of the idea of the stem: (1) מ *subjective*, when preformative of the participles *Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, *Hithpa'el*, and other active conjugations. (2) מ *objective*, when preformative of the participles *Pu'al*, *Hoph'al*, and other passive conjugations, as well as of numerous nouns. (3) מ *instrumental*, as in מַפְתֵּחַ *a key*, &c. (4) מ *local*, as in מִדְּבָר *a drive for cattle*, &c.

f As regards the formation of these nouns, it is to be remarked that the preformative מ was originally in most cases followed by a short *ä*. This *ä*, however, in a closed syllable is frequently attenuated to *i*; in an open syllable before the tone it is lengthened to *ā* (so also the *i*, attenuated from *ä*, is lengthened to *ē*), and in מִנִּי *shield* (with suff. מִנִּי) it even becomes unchangeable *ä*. But in an open syllable which does not stand before the tone, the *a* necessarily becomes vocal *S'wä*.

g The following forms are especially to be noticed: (a) ground-form *māqāl*, in Hebrew מִקָּל ¹, e.g. מִאֲכָל *food*, fem. מִמְלָכָה *kingdom*, מִאֲבָלָה *a knife*, מִלְּבָשָׁה *business*; from a verb מִלְּבָשָׁה by § 23. *c*) *business*; from a verb מִלְּבָשָׁה *a gift*; from verbs מִלְּבָשָׁה *a going forth*, מִלְּבָשָׁה *a seat*; from verbs מִלְּבָשָׁה *the best* (from *maistb*); with י (or *i*) assimilated, מִצֵּעַ *a bed*; from verbs מִצֵּעַ *a screen*, and with the shortening of the *ä* under the preformative, מִמָּר *bitterness* (from *mmar* developed to a segholate), fem. מִשְׁפָּחָה *desolation*; from a verb מִצֵּעַ,

¹ In מִתְחַתִּים Cant. 5, 16. Neh. 8, 10, the first syllable is artificially opened to avoid the cacophony; on the *ä* of the second syllable comp. § 93. *ee*.

probably of this class is **מָקוֹם** *place*, the *ā* lengthened to *ā* and obscured to *θ* (Arabic *māqām*); from verbs **מָרָאָה** *appearance*, **מָצֵן** (for **מַעֲנֶה**) *prop. intention*, only in **לְמַעַן** *on account of, in order that*.

(b) Ground-form *miqtāl* (the usual form of the infin. *Qal* in Aramaic), Hebr. **מִקְטָל**, e.g. **מִקְדָּר** ¹ *a cattle-drive*, fem. **מִלְחָמָה** *war*, **מִרְכָּבָה** *a chariot* (with *S^ghāl* instead of *l*, but in *constr. st.* **מִרְכָּבָתָּה** Gen. 41, 43; comp. **מִרְחָק** *distance*), **מִשְׁמֶרֶת** *a watch*; from verbs **עָרַב**, e.g. **מִסָּב** *a round* (from *mi-sāb*; *l* in the open syllable being lengthened to *ē*; but comp. also **מִשָּׁק** Is. 33, 4 as *constr. state* from **שָׁקַק** with sharpening of the first radical; comp. § 67. g); from verbs **לָיַח**, **מִקְנָה** *a possession*, fem. **מִקְנָה**.

(c) Ground-form *mqṭāl*, Hebr. **מִקְטַל**, e.g. **מִשְׁעָן** *a support* (fem. **מִשְׁעָנָה**), **מִסְגֵּר** *a smith*, fem. **מִכְשֵׁלָה** *a ruin*; from a verb **פָּרַח** *an overthrow*; from verbs **עָרַב**, **מָגֵן** *a shield* (from *mdgīn*), fem. **מִגְנָה** *a roll* (from **גָּלַל**), **מִאָּרָה** *a curse* (for *m^oirra* from **אָרַר**); from a verb **פָּרַח** *a snare* (from *māwqīṣ*).

(d) Ground-form *miqtāl*, Hebr. **מִקְטַל**, e.g. **מִסָּפֵר** *mourning*, **מִזְבֵּחַ** *an altar* (place of sacrifice); from a verb **עָרַב**, e.g. **מִסָּב** *consensus*; (e) ground-form *mqṭāl*, Hebr. **מִקְטַל**, as fem. **מִאֲכָלָה** *food*; from a verb **עָרַב**, fem. **מִסָּה** *a covering* (from **סָבַח**), and also according to the Masora **מִעוֹז** *a refuge*, with suffixes **מִעוֹזִי** and **מִעוֹזִי**, plur. **מִעוֹזִים**. Very probably, however, most if not all of these forms are to be referred to the stem **עוֹז** *to flee for safety*, and therefore should be written **מִעוֹזִי**, &c. The form **מִעוֹז**, if derived from the stem **עוֹז**, would mean *stronghold*.—Cf. also **מִרְדָּה** *faintness*, developed to a segholate, probably from **מִרְדָּה**, for *mārōkh* from **רָכַח**, as **מִתָּחַם** *soundness of body*, from **חָתַם**.

With a long vowel in the second syllable: (f) ground-form *maqṭāl*, in Hebr. always obscured to *θ*, e.g. **מִחְסוֹר** *want*, **מִלְקוֹחַ** *booty*; from verbs **פָּרַח**, e.g. **מִנּוֹר** *fear*, fem. **מִנוֹרָה** and **מִנוֹרָה** (with the *θ* depressed to *ā* in a toneless syllable; comp. § 27. n), **מִרוּקָה**, &c., Is. 22, 5.

(g) Ground-form *miqtāl*, in Hebr. again **מִקְטַל**, e.g. **מִסְתוֹר** *a covert*, **מִכְשׁוֹל** *a stumbling-block* (comp. above, letter i, *mākhālā*); fem. **מִכְמֶרֶת** *a fishing-net*; (h) the ground-forms *maqṭāl* and *miqtāl* (comp. **מִקְוִים**) are found only from participles *Hiph'il*; the fem. **מִבְּלִיגִית** *cheerfulness*, is a denominative formed from a participle *Hiph'il*; (i) ground-form *mqṭāl*, as **מִלְבּוּשׁ** *a garment*.

Rem. On **מ** as preformative of the participles of all the conjugations except *Qal* and *Niph'al*, comp. § 52. c. Many of these participles have become substantives, as **מִפְתָּרֵת** *snuffers*, **מִשְׁחִית** *destroyer, destruction*.

49. Nouns with **נ** prefixed. Besides the participles *Niph'al* (ground-form *niqtāl*, still retained e.g. in **נִלְוָה** for *nāwlā*, but commonly attenuated to *niqtāl*, Hebr. **נִקְטַל**) and the infinitive *Niph'al* of the form **נִקְטַל**, the prefix **נ** is found in **נִמְתָּחִים** *wrestlings*, Gen. 30, 8, which is also to be referred to *Niph'al*.

50. With **ש** prefixed, e.g. **שִׁלְהֶבֶת** *a flame*. On this *šaph'el* formation, cf. § 55. i.

¹ In Jer. 2, 31 also, where Baer requires **הַמִּדְבָּר**, read with ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. **הַמִּדְבָּר**.

- p* 51. Nouns with ת prefixed. Examples of this formation are numerous, especially from weak stems, for the purpose of strengthening them phonetically (see Barth, *ibid.*, p. 283), and notably from verbs ו'פ and ו'ע. They may be classified as follows:—(a) the ground-form *tāqtāl* in תַּחֲמָס *ostrich* (?); from verbs ו'פ, תוֹשֵׁב *a settler*, fem. תוֹשֵׁבָה *expectation*, תוֹכַחַת (from the *Hiph'il* תוֹכִיחַ *correction*; from a verb ו'פ, תִּימֵן *the south*; from verbs ו'פ and ו'ה, תוֹדָה *thanksgiving*, and תוֹרָה *law*, both from *Hiph'il*; from a verb ו'פ and ו'א, תוֹצֵאוֹת *issues*; probably belonging to this class, from verbs ו'ע, תְּבִלָּה *confusion*, and תִּמְסָה *a melting away* (developed from תִּבְלָה and תִּמָּס, from תִּלָּל and תִּמָּס).
- q* (b) *Tāqtāl*, e.g. fem. תִּפְאָרָה and תִּפְאָרֶת *glory*; from a verb ו'ה, e.g. תִּקְוָה *hope*; (c) *tāqtāl*, e.g. תִּשְׁבָּץ *chequer work*, fem. תִּרְדָּמָה *deep sleep* (probably from the *Niph'al* תִּרְדֵּם); from a verb ו'פ, תוֹכַחַת *correction* (from the *Hiph'il*-stem, like the constr. st. plur. תוֹלְדוֹת *generations*); from verbs ו'ע, תְּהִלָּה *praise*, תְּפִלָּה *prayer* (from the *Pi'el* of the stems תִּלָּל and תִּפַּל).
- r* With a long vowel in the second syllable: (d) *tāqtāl*, as תְּהוֹם *the ocean, the deep* (for *tihām*; in Assyrian the fem. *tādmu*, constr. st. *tādmāt*, is the usual word for *sea*), unless it is to be derived with Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 113, from the stem תהם; (e) *tāqtāl* (in Arabic the usual form of the infinitive of conjugation II. which corresponds to the Hebrew *Pi'el*), e.g. from a verb ו'ה, fem. תְּכִלִּית *completeness*; תִּרְבִּיית *increase, usury*, with a parallel form תִּרְבִּיית in a passive sense, תִּלְמִיד *a disciple*; (f) תִּמְנוּל *e.g. תִּמְנוּל an apple* (for *tānmāl*); very frequently used to form abstracts, e.g. תִּנְמוּלָה *a benefit* (also תִּנְמוּלָה); תִּפְשָׁעָה *perverseness*; from verbs ו'ע, תִּבְנוּחָה *a treading down*, תִּנְנוּחָה *a waving* (like תִּרְנוּחָה *a lifting up*, from the *Hiph'il* stem), &c.; very frequently also as an abstract plural, e.g. תִּחְבִּלוֹת *guidance*, תִּמְרוּרִים *bitterness*, תִּנְחֻמִּים and תִּנְחֻמוֹת *consolation*; from a verb ו'ע, תִּנְחֻמָּה *toil*.

XI. Nouns with Affirmatives.

- s* 52. Nouns with ל affixed. Perhaps חֲשֵׁמֶל *amber* (?), and certainly בְּרִזְלִין *iron*, בְּרִמְלָה *a fruitful field* (*S'ghōl* in both cases is probably an intensification of the original *ā* in the tone-syllable), זִבְעֵל *bloom*, comp. § 30. *q*.
- t* 53. Nouns with ם affixed. With an original *ām* as affirmative, אֵימָל *vestibule* (although the *ā* in the *sing.* remains unchangeable), plur. אֵימָלִים; אֵלִיָּם *a swarm of gnats* (if from בָּנָן *a ladder* (if from סָלָל); with original affirmative *ām*, עִירָם (also עִירָם) *naked* (from עוֹר), plur. עִירָמִים Gen. 3, 7, parallel form עִירָם, plur. עִירָמִים Gen. 2, 25.—To this class also belong the adverbs in *ām* and *ām*, mentioned in § 100. *g*, and many proper names, as גִּרְשָׁם, also גִּרְשָׁם, and גִּרְשָׁן, *patronymic* גִּרְשָׁי *patronymic*, מִלְכָּם, עֲמָרָם, &c.; on the other hand, the form גִּרְשָׁיוֹם *ransom*, Num. 3, 49, from a verb ו'ה, probably stands merely for the ordinary גִּרְשָׁיוֹן, on account of the following *ם*.
- u* 54. Nouns with ך affixed. The ך is added by means of a simple helping vowel in בְּנֵעָן *Canaan*, and צִפְרֵן *a finger nail*; more frequently the addition is made by means of a tone-bearing *ā*, which in Hebrew is modified to *S'ghōl* (as צִפְרֵן *axe*)

or lengthened to *ā* (but cf. also אֶחָרִית and אֶחָרִית; e.g. קִנְיָן *a possession*, שֻׁלְחָן *a table*, קָרְבָּן *an offering*. From an original *ā* being changed into an obscure *ō* there probably arise such forms as דָּאָבֹן *a pining away*; דָּרְבֹן (also דָּרְבָן) *a goad*; רָעָבֹן *hunger*; from verbs לָ'ה נָאוֹן *pride*, הָמוֹן *noise*, חֲזוֹן *a vision*; שָׂרְיוֹן *a coat of mail*; from a verb שָׂ'ן שָׂאוֹן *guile* (the only instance with both *ō* preformative and *ōn* affirmative)¹; very frequently from the simple stem with an unorganic sharpening of the second radical, e.g. זָכָרֹן *memorial*, בָּלְיוֹן *destruction* (constr. st. וְכָרֹן and בָּלְיוֹן), &c.; comp. also הָרִיוֹן *pregnancy* (for הָרִי) and § 93. *uu*. Proper names occur with the termination *ān*, as יִשְׂרָאֵל, § 86. *g*.

Rem. A large number of proper names now ending in ה' or י used to be classed as nouns originally formed with the suffix יָן. The subsequent rejection of the final *Nān* seemed to be confirmed by the form מְנַדָּן, once used (Zech. 12, 11) for מְנַדָּו (and conversely in Prov. 27, 20 מְנַדָּה *Kethibh*, Q^{re} מְנַדָּו for מְנַדָּן *destruction*), also by the fact that for שְׁלֹמֹה the LXX give the form Σολωμών or Σαλωμών, and especially that in the patronymics and tribal names (§ 86. *h*) a *Nān* appears before the termination *t*, as גִּילֹנִי *Gilonite* from גִּלָּה and שִׁילֹנִי from שִׁילָה (modern name *Sailān*). Wetzstein, however (in Delitzsch's *Commentary on Job*, 1st ed., p. 599), explained the *Nān* in מְנַדָּן as a secondary addition to the common old-Palestinian termination *ō* (יִרְחֹו, רְמוֹנוֹ, &c.), and Barth (*Nominalbildung*, § 224. *b*) has since shown the unsoundness of the prevailing view on other grounds: the rejection of the *Nān* would be much more likely to occur in the numerous appellatives in *ōn* than in proper names; גִּילֹנִי and שִׁילֹנִי are due to the necessity of avoiding, for euphonic reasons, such forms as גִּילֹ-*t*, שִׁילֹ-*t*, &c.; cf. also שְׁלֹנִי from שִׁלָּה.

On the affirmatives '—, '—, וְה, ית—, see below, § 86. *h-l*.

XII. Quadriliterals and Quinqueliterals.

55. מְלֹמֶד *sterilis*, חֶלְמִישׁ *a flint*, and the fem. וְלֶעֱפָה *a glow*, &c., have probably arisen from the insertion of a ל; חֶרְגָל *a locust*, מְרָדִם *an axe*, מְרַעְפָּה *a branch*, Ezek. 31, 5 (verses 6. 8 מְרַעְפָּה), from insertion of a ר. Comp., moreover, חֶרְמִישׁ *a sickle*, מְרַדֵּר *vine-blossom*; with an initial ע, עֶמְלָה *a bat*, עֶמְבִּישׁ *a spider*, עֶמְבֵּר *a mouse*, עֶמְבֵּר *a scorpion*², &c. Quinqueliteral, עֶמְבֵּרֶע *a frog*.

¹ The plurals נִפְעִימִים *flowers*, Cant. 2, 12, and קִשְׁלָנִים *thorns* appear to be formed directly from the singulars נִפְעָה (comp. נִפְעָה) and קִשְׁלָה with the insertion of *ān* (which becomes obscured to *ōn*). See Nöldeke, *Mand. Gr.*, p. 169, Rem. 3; similarly, according to Hoffmann, 'Einige phöniz. Inschriften,' p. 15 (*Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissensch.*, xxxvi), עֶמְבֵּרִים *wares*, Ezek. 27, 14. 16, from עֶמְבֵּר = עֶמְבֵּר.

² Derenbourg (*Revue des études juives*, 1883, p. 165) infers from the above examples and a comparison of the Arabic 'usfir, sparrow (from safara, to chirp), that ע was especially employed to form quadriliteral names of animals.

§ 86. Denominative Nouns.

- a* 1. Such are all nouns formed immediately from another noun, whether the latter be primitive or derived from a verb, e.g. **קָדְמוֹן** *eastern*, immediately from **קָדַם** *the east* (verbal stem **קָדַם** *to be in front*).
- b* 2. Most of the forms which nouns of this class assume have already been given in §§ 84 and 85, since the denominatives, as secondary (although in some cases very old) forms, invariably follow the analogy of the verbal derivatives. As, for instance, the verbals with a prefixed **מ** (§ 85. *e* to *m*) express the place &c. of an action, so the denominatives with **מ** *local* represent the place where a thing is found or its neighbourhood (see letter *e*).
- c* The most common forms of denominatives are—
1. Those like the participle Qal (§ 84 *a*, letter *s*), e.g. **שַׁעַר** *a porter*, from **שָׁעַר** *a gate*; **בָּקֵר** *a herdsman*, from **בָּקַר** *a herd*; **בָּרֵם** *a vinedresser*, from **בָּרַם** *a vineyard*.
- d* 2. Those like the form *qāṭṭāl* (§ 84 *b*, letter *b*), e.g. **קָשֶׁת** *an archer*, from **קָשַׁת** *a bow*. Both these forms (letters *c* and *d*) indicate customary occupations, inhering in the subject, like Greek nouns in *της, τεύς*, e.g. *πολίτης, γραμματεύς*.
- e* 3. Nouns with **מ** prefixed, denoting the place where a thing is (comp. § 85. *e*), or its neighbourhood, e.g. **מַעְיָן** *a place of fountains*, from **עָיַן**; **מְרִנְלוֹת** *the place about the feet*, from **רָאשׁוֹת** *the place about the head*, from **רָאשׁ**; **מִקְשָׁה** (for **מִקְשָׁה**) *a cucumber field*, from **קָשָׁה** *cucumber*. Comp. *ἀμπελῶν* from *ἀμπελος*.
- f* 4. Nouns with the termination **וֹ** or **וִי** to express adjectival ideas: **קָדְמוֹן** *eastern*, from **קָדַם**; **אַחֲרוֹן** *posterior*, from **אַחַר**; **חַיצוֹן** *exterior*, from **חָוָה**; probably also **לִיָּוִי** *coiled*, hence *coiled animal, serpent*, from **לָוִיָּה** *a winding*; **נְחֹשֶׁתִין** *brass*, from **נְחָשֶׁת** *brass*. Also abstracts, e.g. **עֵרְוָה** *blindness*, from **עָרַה**. Comp. § 85. *u*.—With a double termination (*ḥn* or *ḥn* with *ḥ*) **אֶדְמוֹנִי** *reddish*, **יָדְעוֹנִי** *a knowing* (spirit); **צַפְעוֹנִי** *basilisk*; **רַחֲמִינִי** *merciful* [fem. plur.].
- g* **אֵישׁוֹן** appears to be used as a diminutive ending (comp. the Syriac **אֵישׁוֹן** *little man* (in the eye), *apple of the eye*, from **אֵישׁ**; on the other hand **עֵשֶׁבֶת**

[¹ Cf. Barth, § 212; König, ii. 1, 113. Diminutives in Semitic languages are, however, most commonly formed by inserting a *y* after the second radical, e.g. Aram. **עֵשֶׁבֶת**, Syr. **عَصْبَت**, Arab. **عَصْبَت** *a very young man*, *kulaib*, *a little dog*, &c. Since Olshausen (§ 180), **עֵשֶׁבֶת** *a little* (Is. 28, 10. 13. Job 36, 2) has commonly been regarded as an example of the same form, to which others have added **שְׁבִיטִים** Is. 3, 18 (as though a foreign dialectical form for *shumais*, *little sun*), and **אֶשְׁבִּיטָה** Sam. 13, 20, as a contemptuous diminutive form of **אֶשְׁבִּיטָה**; cf. Ewald, § 167, W. Wright, *Arab. Gramm.*³ i. § 269, De Lagarde, *Nominalbildung*, pp. 85–87, König, ii. 1, p. 143 sq. The existence of the form in Hebrew is disputed by Barth, § 192. *d*.]

adder, which was formerly regarded as a diminutive, is properly an adjectival form from *שָׁפַף* to rub (hence, as it were, a *rubbing* creature); in the same way *יִשְׂרָאֵל* is a *denominative* from *יָשַׁר* (= *יָשָׁר*) and not a *diminutive* (*pious little people*, and the like), but properly *upright* (*righteous people*); finally, *שֶׁתְּרוֹן* is not *lunula*, but an *artificial moon* (used as an ornament), and *צְוָרִים* not *little neck*, but *necklace* (from *צוּר* neck). Comp. Delitzsch on Cant. 4, 9.

5. Peculiar to this class of nouns is the termination *ִי*, which converts *h* a substantive into an adjective, and is added especially to numerals and names of persons and countries, in order to form *ordinals, patronymics, and tribal names*; e.g. *רֶגֶל* *footman*, plur. *רֶגְלִים*, from *רֶגֶל* *foot*; *אֶבְרִי* *cruel*, *נֶכְרִי* *strange*, from *נֶכֶד* *strangeness*, *תַּחְתִּי* *lower*, from *תַּחַת* *below*, fem. *תַּחְתִּיָּה* and *תַּחְתִּיָּה*, plur. *תַּחְתִּיָּה*, *שֵׁשִׁי* *the sixth*, from *שֵׁשׁ* *six*; *מוֹאָבִי* *Moabite*, from *מוֹאָב*, plur. *מוֹאָבִים*, fem. *מוֹאָבִיָּה* and *מוֹאָבִיָּה*, plur. *מוֹאָבִיָּה*, *עִבְרִי* *Hebrew*, plur. *עִבְרִיָּה*, *יִשְׂרָאֵלִי* *Israelite*, from *יִשְׂרָאֵל*. When the original substantive is a *compound*, it is resolved again into two words, e.g. *בְּנֵימִינִי* *Benjamite*, from *בְּנֵימִן* (comp. on the use of the article in such cases, § 127. d).

Instead of *ִי* we find in a few cases (a) the ending *ִי* (as in Aram.), *i* e.g. *כְּפִילִי* (*crafty*, or, according to others, *churlish*) if it stands for *נֶכְרִי* and is not rather from a stem *כלא* or *כלה*; *חֹרִי* *white cloth*, Is. 19, 9 in pause; perhaps also *גִּזְבִּי* *a swarm of locusts*, Am. 7, 1. Nah. 3, 17; hardly *נִנְיָוִי* Is. 38, 20. Hab. 3, 19; but certainly in proper names as *בָּרְזַלִּי* (*ferreus*) *Barsillai*¹; and (b) *ִי*, arising from *אֵשׁ*, in *אֶשְׁרִי* *belonging to fire* (*אֵשׁ*), i. e. *a sacrifice offered by fire*; *לִבְנָה* (prop. *milky*) *the storax-shrub*, Arabic *lubnay*.

6. *Abstract nouns formed from concretes* by the addition of *ִי* [§ 95. f.) *k* comp. our terminations *-dom, -hood, -ness*, e.g. *יְלֻדָּה* *youth*, *מַלְכוּת* *kingdom* (the loosely closed syllable seems to show that the *šwā* is weakened from a full vowel); *אַלְמָנוּת* *widowhood*, from *אַלְמָן* *widower*, *אַלְמָנָה* *widow*. In Aram. this fem. ending *ִי* (or *ִי* with rejection of the *ת*) is a common termination of the infinitive in the derived conjugations (comp., as substantival infinitives of this kind, *הַשְׁמָעוּת* *the announcing*, Ezek. 24, 26, and *הַתְּחַבְּרֻת* *the making of a league*, Dan. 11, 23); in Hebr. *ִי* as a termination to express abstract ideas (as well as those which appear to be directly derived from the verbal stem, as *סְכָלָה* *folly*, *רְפָאוּת* *a healing**) becomes more common only in the later Books. It is affixed to adjectives ending in *ִי* (see above, letter *h*) in *אֶבְרִיָּה* *cruelty*, and *קוֹמְמִיָּה* *upright position* (Lev. 26, 13, used adverbially).

The ending *ִי* is found earlier, e.g. in *שְׂאִרִית* *remainder*, *רִאשִׁית* *principium*, from *רִאשׁ* = *ראש* *princeps*. The termination *ִי* seems to occur in *חֵכְמוֹת* *wisdom* (in Prov. 1, 20. 9, 1, joined to a *singular*; so also *חֵכְמוֹת* Prov. 14, 1, where, probably, *חֵכְמוֹת* should likewise be read) and in *הוֹלָלוֹת* Eccles. 1, 17, &c., with the parallel form *הוֹלָלוֹת* Eccles. 10, 13.

¹ On *ִי* as an old fem. ending, see above, § 80. l.

² See a complete list of instances in König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 1, p. 205 sq.

§ 87. Of the Plural¹.

- a* 1. The regular plural termination for the masculine gender is יִם, e.g. סוס horse, plur. סוסים horses; but also very often written defectively מִ, especially when in the same word one of the vowel letters, ו or י, precedes, e.g. Gen. 1, 21 תַּיִם. Nouns in יִ make their plural in יִים, e.g. עֲבָרִי a Hebrew, plur. עֲבָרִיִּים (Ex. 3, 18); but usually contraction takes place, e.g. עֲבָרִים; שָׁנִים crimson garments, from שָׁנִי.
- b* Nouns in הִ lose this termination when they take the plural ending, e.g. חֹהֵה seer, plur. חֹהִים (comp. § 75. *h*).—In regard to the loss of the tone from the מִ in the two old plurals מַיִם water and שָׁמַיִם heaven, comp. § 88. *d* and § 96.
- c* The termination יִ is sometimes assumed also by feminines (comp. נָשִׁים women, § 96 under אִשָּׁה; שָׁנִים years, from שָׁנָה; רְחֵלִים ewes, from רָחֵל), and is employed besides to represent intensive ideas (§ 124. *e*), so that an indication of gender is not necessarily combined with it (comp. also below, letters *m-p*).
- d* This ending *fm* is also common in Phoenician, e.g. צִדְנִים Sidonii; Aramaic has *fn*; Arabic *āna* (nominative) and *fna* (in the oblique cases, but in vulgar Arabic *fn* is also used for the nominative); in Ethiopic *ām*. Comp. also the verbal ending יִן.
- e* Less frequent, or only apparent terminations of the plur. masc. are—
(*a*) יִ, as in Aramaic², found almost exclusively in the later Books of the Old Testament (apart from the poetical use in some of the older and even the oldest portions), viz. צָרִיכִין 1 Ki. 11, 33, the guard, 2 Ki. 11, 13, חֲטִיין wheat, Ezek. 4, 9; defectively אִיִּין islands, Ezek. 26, 18; יָמִין days, Dan. 12, 13. Comp. also כִּרְמִיין carpets, Jud. 5, 10 (in the North-Palestinian song of Deborah, which has also other linguistic peculiarities); עֲרִיין heaps, Mic. 3, 12 (? caused by the following ת); קִלִּין words (from the Aram. קִלָּה), Job 4, 2, and twelve other places in Job (beside קִלִּים, ten times in Job); further, חֲרִיין Job 24, 22, אֲחִירִין 31, 10, and שִׁמְרִיין Lam. 1, 4, תַּנִּין 4, 3.—The following form is doubtful:
- f* (*b*) יִ (with the מ rejected, as, according to some, in the dual יְדֵי for יָדַיִם Ezek. 13, 18, comp. § 88. *c*), e.g. כְּנִי stringed instruments, Ps. 45, 9 for כְּנִיִּים

¹ Cf. Mayer Lambert, 'Remarques sur la formation du pluriel hébreu,' in the *Revue des études juives*, xxiv. p. 99 sqq.

² On the connexion between all these endings see Dietrich's *Abhandl. zur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 51 sqq.; Halévy, *Revue des études juives*, 1887, p. 138 sqq.; [cf. also Driver, *Tenses*, § 6, *Obs.* 2.]

³ So also always on the Méša' stone, e.g. line 2 שְׁלֹשָׁן thirty; line 4 מֶלְכִין kings; line 5 יַמִּין many days, &c.

(unless it is to be so written)¹; עַמִּי *peoples*, Ps. 144, 2, and, probably, also Lam. 3, 14 (in 2 Sam. 22, 44 it may be understood as עַמִּי *my people*; comp. in the parallel passage Ps. 18, 44 עַם; also in Cant. 8, 2 the *f* of רַמְנִי is better regarded as a *suffix*); see also 2 Sam. 23, 8 as compared with 1 Chron. 11, 11; 1 Sam. 20, 38 *Kth*, and on the whole question Gesenius, *Lehrgebäude*, p. 524 sqq. More doubtful still is—

(c) יֶ— (like the constr. state in Syriac), which is supposed to appear in e.g. שָׂרֵי *g* *princes*, Jud. 5, 15 (perhaps *my princes* is intended: read with LXX שָׂרִים); for חֲלוֹנֵי סָפֹן Jer. 22, 14 (according to others *dual*, see § 88. c) read חֲלוֹנֵי וּסְ. On חֲלוֹנֵי and חֲוָרֵי, which were formerly so explained, see above, § 86. i.—חֲשֹׁמֵי (for which the right reading is certainly חֲשֹׁמֵי) Is. 20, 4 can only be intended by the Masora as a singular with the formative syllable יֶ— = *bareness*; in אֲדֹנֵי the Lord (prop. *my lord*, from the plur. *majestatis*, אֲדֹנִים *lord*), the *ay* was originally a suffix, § 135. q.

(d) ׀— a supposed plural ending in בָּנִים = בָּנִים *gnats* (or *lice*), which, *h* however, is probably rather a collective sing. (from the stem בָּנָן) with the formative syllable ׀—; so סֻלָּם *ladder* (supposed by some to be a plur. like our *stairs*) appears to be similarly formed from סָלָל; comp. on both, § 85. i.

2. The plural termination of the *feminine gender* is generally *i* indicated by the termination וֹת (often written defectively תֹּ—, e.g. תְּהִלָּה *song of praise, psalm*, plur. תְּהִלוֹת (only in post-biblical Hebrew תְּהִלִּים, as in the titles of the printed editions, as well as סֵפֶר תְּהִלוֹת *the Book of Psalms*); אִתְּרָה *a letter*, plur. אִתְּרוֹת; בְּאֵר *a well*, plur. בְּאֵרוֹת. Feminines in תֹּ— form their plural in וֹת, e.g. מִצְרִיּוֹת *an Egyptian woman*, plur. מִצְרִיּוֹת; and those in וֹת either make וֹת, as מְלָכּוֹת *kingdom*, plur. מְלָכּוֹת, Dan. 8, 22 (cf. חֲצִיּוֹת *cells*, Jer. 37, 16), or are inflected like עֲדוּת *testimonies* (pronounced 'ēdh'wōth for 'ēdhūwōth).

It is only from a mistake or disregard of these feminine endings וֹת and תֹּ— *k* that some words ending with them form their plural by the addition of יִם or תִּים, e.g. חֲנִית *spear*, plur. חֲנִיתוֹת and חֲנִיתִים; זִנוּת *whoredom*, plur. זִנוּתִים (by the side of זִנוּתִים; זִנוּתִים *widowhood*; שְׁחִיתוֹת *pits*, &c.

The termination *-ōth* stands primarily for *-dth* (which is the form it has in Arab., *l* Eth., in the *constr. st.* of Western Aramaic, in Eastern Syriac, and also in Assyrian, Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammm.*, p. 187; on the change of *d* into an obscure *θ*, see § 9. q). On the other hand, it is doubtful whether this *dth* is to be regarded as a lengthened and stronger form of the singular fem. ending *dth* (comp. § 80. δ).

¹ According to some this *f* is simply due to a neglect of the point (§ 5. m), which in MSS. and elsewhere marked the abbreviation of the plur. ending. Hence Cheyne (after Lowth) emends Is. 5, 1 into שִׁירַת דֹּדִים *a love-song*.

How the changeable vowels of a noun are shortened or become vocal *Ṣwā* in consequence of the addition of the plural endings is explained in §§ 92-95.

m 3. Words which in the singular are used both as masculine and feminine (§ 122. *d*), often have in the plural parallel forms with the masculine and feminine terminations, e.g. עָב *cloud*, plur. עָבִים and עֲבוֹת; and each form may be treated either as masculine or feminine, according to the usage of the particular word.—But even those words, of which the gender is invariable, sometimes have both plural forms, e.g. דֹּר masc. *a generation*, plur. דֹּרִים and דֹּרוֹת; שָׁנָה fem. *a year*, plur. שָׁנִים and שָׁנוֹת (see the Rem.). In these words the gender of the plural forms remains the same as in the singular, e.g. אֶרֶץ masc. *a lion*, plur. אֶרְצוֹת masc., Zeph. 3, 3, דֹּרוֹת masc., Job 42, 16.

n Sometimes usage makes a distinction between the two plural forms of the same word. Thus, יָמִים *days*, שָׁנִים *years* are the usual, but יָמוֹת (only twice, in the constr. st. Deut. 32, 7, Ps. 90, 15) and שָׁנוֹת (also only in the constr. st. and before suffixes) are rarer poetic forms.

o A difference of meaning appears in several names of members of the body, the dual (see § 88) denoting the living members themselves, while the plur. in *וֹת* expresses something like them, but without life (§ 122. *u*), e.g. יָדַי *hands*, יָדוֹת *artificial hands*, also e.g. the *arms* of a throne; כַּפַּי *hands*, כַּפּוֹת *handles* (Lat. *manubria*); פֶּעַם *foot*, פֶּעֻמוֹת *artificial feet* (of the ark), קַרְנַי *horns*, קַרְנוֹת *horns* (of the altar); עֵינַי *eyes*, עֵינוֹת *fountains*.

p 4. A considerable number of masculines form their plural in *וֹת*, while many feminines have a plural in *ִים*. The gender of the singular, however, as a rule remains the same in the plural, e.g. אָב *father*, plur. אֲבוֹת; פְּרָעוֹת *princes*, from פָּרַע; מֵאוֹר *a light*, plur. מֵאוֹרִים and מְאוֹרֵה, comp. Gen. 1, 16; שֵׁם *name*, plur. שְׁמוֹת; פִּלְגֶּשֶׁת *concubine*, plur. פִּלְגֶּשִׁים.

q Feminines ending in *ה* which take in the plural the termination *ִים* are אֶלְהָ *terebinth*, אִימָה *terror*, דְּבַלְהָ *a cake of figs*, חֲמֶה *wheat*, לִבְנָה *a brick*, מִלָּה (only in poetry) *a word*, מֵאָה *a dry measure*, שְׁעוֹרָה *barley*, and the following names of animals דְּבוּרָה *a bee* and יוֹנָה *a dove*; also, for בִּרְיָה fem. *eggs*, a singular בִּרְיָה is to be assumed. אֶלְמָה *sheaf* and שָׁנָה *year* (see above, letter *n*) take both *ִים* and *וֹת*; comp. finally שְׂפֵלֶת *an ear of corn*, plur. שְׂפֵלִים.

r 5. A strict distinction in gender between the two plural endings is found, in fact, only in adjectives and participles, e.g. כּוֹבִים *boni*, כּוֹבוֹת *bonae*, קָטָלִים masc., קָטָלוֹת fem. So also in substantives of the

same stem, where there is an express distinction of sex, as בָּנִים *fili*, בָּנוֹת *filiae*; מְלָכִים *reges*, מְלָכוֹת *reginae*.

Rem. 1. In some few words there is added to the plural ending הַ a second masculine plural termination (in the form of the constr. st. יָ, comp. § 89. c), or a dual ending יָ, e.g. בֵּמָקָה *a high place*, plur. בְּמָוֹת, constr. st. בְּמֹתַי (also בְּמֹתַי *bām'ihē*, Is. 14, 14, Job 9, 8, &c., sometimes as *Q'el* to the Kethibh בְּמֹתַי; see § 95. o); מִרְאשְׁתִּי שָׂאֵל *from Saul's head*, 1 Sam. 26, 12; חוֹמָה *wall*, plur. חוֹמוֹת *moenia*, whence dual חוֹמָתַי *double walls*. This double indication of the plural appears also in the connexion of suffixes with the plural ending הַ (§ 91. m).

2. Some nouns are only used in the singular (e.g. אָדָם *man*, and collectively *men*); a number of other nouns only in the plural, e.g. מְנוּחִים *men* (the old *sing.* מְנוּחַ is only preserved in proper names, see § 90. o; in Eth. the *sing.* is *mēt*, man); some of these have, moreover, a singular meaning (§ 124. a), as פָּנִים *face*. In such cases, however, these forms can also express plurality, e.g. פָּנִים means also *faces*, Gen. 40, 7. Ezek. 1, 6; comp. אֱלֹהִים *God*, and also *gods* (the *sing.* אֱלֹהַּ, except in Job and Daniel, occurs only ten times. [In Job it occurs forty-one and in Daniel four times]).

§ 88. Of the Dual.

Comp. the literature on the Semitic dual in Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.* (Wien, 1886), p. 21.

1. The *dual* is a further indication of number, which originated ^a in early times. In Hebrew, however, it is almost exclusively used to denote those objects which naturally occur in pairs (see letter *e*). The dual termination is never found in adjectives, verbs or pronouns. In the noun it is indicated in both genders by the termination יָ (no doubt connected with the plural ending יָ) appended to the ground-form¹, e.g. יָדַי *both hands*, יָמֵי *two days*. Instead of the feminine ending תָּ, the dual form is always added to the old ending *ath*, but necessarily with *ā* (since it is in an open syllable before the tone), thus יָמֵי, e.g. שִׁפְתָּה *lip*, שִׁפְתָּי *both lips*. From a feminine with the ending תָּ, e.g. נְחֹשֶׁת (from *n'hušt*) the dual is formed like נְחֹשֶׁתַי *double fetters*.

With nouns which in the singular have not a feminine ending, the ^b dual termination is likewise really added to the ground-form; but the latter generally undergoes certain changes in consequence of the

¹ On dual endings appended to the plural see § 87. s and § 95. o at the beginning.

shifting of the tone, e. g. **כְּנָף** *wing* (ground-form *kānāph*), dual **כְּנָפִים**, the first *ā* becoming *Šwā*, since it no longer stands before the tone, and the second *ā* being lengthened before the new tone syllable. In 1 Ki. 16, 24. 2 Ki. 5, 23 the form **כְּבָרִים** evidently merely points to the *constr. st.* **כְּבָרִי**, which would be expected before **כִּסֵּף**; cf. **כְּבָרִים** in 2 Ki. 5, 23, and on the syntax see § 131. *d*. In the segholate forms (§ 84 *a*, letter *a*) the dual ending is mostly added to the ground-form, e. g. **רַגְלִים** *foot* (ground-form *rāgl*), dual **רַגְלִים**; comp., however, **קַרְנִים** (only in the book of Daniel), as well as **קַרְנִים** from **קֶרֶן** *horn*, and **לְחָיִים** from **לֶחִי** *cheek* (as if from the plurals **קָרְנוֹת**, **לְחָיִים**).

- c* Rem. 1. Certain place-names were formerly reckoned as dual-forms (so in earlier editions of this Grammar, and still in König's *Lehrgebäude*, ii. p. 437) as—
 (a) those in **כְּנָ** and **כְּ**, e. g. **כְּנָת** Gen. 37, 17, and **כְּנָת** 2 Ki. 6, 13; **כְּנָת** Jos. 21, 32, identical with **כְּנָתִים** in 1 Chron. 6, 61 (cf. also the Moabite names of towns in the Mēša' inscription, line 10 **כְּרִיתָן** = Hebrew **כְּרִיתָיִם**; line 30 **בֵּית דִּבְלָתָיִם** = **בֵּית דִּבְלָתִים** Jer. 48, 22; lines 31, 32 **חֹרְזָנִים** = **חֹרְזָן** Is. 15, 5, &c.); (b) in **כְּ**, so **כְּעִינִים** Jos. 15, 34 (= **כְּעִינִים** Gen. 38, 21). The view that **כְּ** and **כְּ** arise from a contraction of the dual terminations **כְּ** (as in Western Aramaic, cf. also nom. *āni*, accus. *aini*, of the dual in Arabic) and **כְּ** seemed to be supported by the Mēša' inscription, where we find (line 20) **כְּמֵאֲתָיִן** *two hundred* = **כְּמֵאֲתָיִם**, Hebrew **כְּמֵאֲתָיִם**. But in many of these supposed duals either a dual sense cannot be detected at all, or it does not agree at any rate with the nature of the Semitic dual, as found elsewhere. Hence it can hardly be doubted that **כְּ** and **כְּ** in these place-names only arise from a subsequent expansion of the terminations **כְּ** and **כְּ**: so Wellhausen, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, xxi. 433; Philippi, *ZDMG*. xxxii. 65 sq.; Barth, *Nominalbildung*, p. 319, note 5; Strack, *Kommentar zur Genesis*, p. 139. The strongest argument in favour of this opinion is that we have a clear case of such an expansion in the *Qrē perpetuum* (§ 17. *c*) **יְרוּשָׁלַיִם** for **יְרוּשָׁלַם**; (so, according to Strack, even in old MSS. of the Mišna; cf. *Urusalim* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, and the Aramaic form **יְרוּשָׁלַם**: similarly in the Aramaic **שְׁמֶרֶן** = **שְׁמֶרֶן** for the Hebrew **שְׁמֶרֶן** *Samaria*.—We may add to this list **נַהֲרָיִם**, **נַהֲרָיִם** (*the river country*), **מִצְרָיִם** *Egypt*, Phoenician **מִצְרַם**; also the words denoting time, **צַהֲרָיִם** *midday* (Mēša' inscription, line 15 **צַהֲרָם**), and perhaps **עֶרְבָיִם** in *the evening*, if the regular expression **בֵּין הָעֶרְבָיִם** Ex. 12, 6. 16, 12, &c., is only due to mistaking **עֶרְבָיִם** for a dual: LXX *πρὸς ἑσπεραν, τὸ δειλινόν, ὅψε*, and only in Lev. 23, 5 *ἀπὸ μέσον τῶν ἑσπερινῶν*.

Instead of the supposed dual **יְרֵי** Ezek. 13, 18 read **יְרֵי**. On **חַלּוֹנִי** (generally taken to be a *double window*) Jer. 22, 14, see above, § 87. *g*.

- d* 2. Only apparently dual-forms are the words **מַיִם** *water* and **שָׁמַיִם** *heaven*, the termination *fm* having abnormally lost the tone, which it otherwise always takes (§ 87. *a*), and become shortened. Only of **מַיִם** is the sing. **מַי** preserved in the

proper name אֶחָדָי; cf., however, Arab. *ma'un* and *sāmā'un*, Eth. *māy* and *samdy*¹, Assy. *mā* (plur. *mē* and *māmē*) and *šamā* (plur. *šamē* and *šamāmē*).

2. The use of the dual in Hebrew is confined, except in the ^e numerals 2, 12, 200, &c. (see § 97), practically to those objects which are by nature or art always found in *pairs*, especially to the double members of the body (but not necessarily so, comp. יָדַיְתִי and יָדַיְתִי *arms*, never in the dual), e. g. יָדַיְתִי *both hands*, אָזְנוֹיְתִי *both ears*, שִׁנָּיְתִי *teeth* (of both rows); also נַעֲלַיְתִי *a pair of sandals*, מִאֲזֵנַיְתִי *a pair of scales*, Lat. *bilanx*, &c., or things which are at least thought of as forming a pair, e. g. יָמֵי *two* (successive) *days*, Lat. *biduum*; שָׁבָעִי *two weeks*; שְׁנָתַיְתִי *two years* (in succession), Lat. *biennium*; אַמְתַּיְתִי *two cubits*².

In the former case the dual may be used for a plural, either indefinite or defined ^f by a numeral, where it is thought of in a double arrangement, e. g. אַרְבַּע רַגְלַיְתִי *four feet*, Lev. 11, 23; שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפַיְתִי *six wings* (i. e. three pairs), Is. 6, 2. Ezek. 1, 6; even שִׁבְעָה עֵינַיְתִי *seven eyes*, Zech. 3, 9, כָּל-כַּפְּיָתִי *all knees*, Ezek. 7, 17; כָּל-יָדַיְתִי *all hands*, Ezek. 21, 7; מִצְלִיָתִי *cymbals*, Ezr. 3, 10; שְׁפָתַיְתִי *double-hooks*, Ezek. 40, 43.—To express a certain emphasis the numeral *two* is used with the dual, as in Jud. 16, 28. Amos 3, 12.—See some other remarks on the use of the dual in § 87. o and s.

It is not impossible that Hebrew at an earlier period made a more extensive and freer use of the dual, and that the restrictions and limitations of its use, mentioned above, belong to a relatively later phase of development in the language. The Arabic literary language forms the dual in the noun, pronoun, and verb, almost as extensively as the Sanskrit or Greek; but in modern Arabic it has almost entirely disappeared in the verb, pronoun, and adjective. The Syriac has preserved it only in a few stereotyped forms, with which such duals as the Latin *duo*, *ambo*, *octo* may be compared. In the same way, the dual of the Sanskrit is lost in the modern Indian languages, and its full use in Old Slavonic has been restricted later, e. g. in Bohemian, just as in Hebrew, to *pairs*, such as hands, feet, eyes, ears. On the Germanic dual, see Grimm's *Gramm.*, 2nd ed., i. p. 814. ^g

¹ According to Barth, *ZDMG.* xlii. p. 341, the Hebrew *māy*, *šamdy* also are only shortened from original *māy* and *šamdy*, while the plurals מַיִם, שְׁמַדִּים are, in his opinion, formed on a false analogy, due to the fact that the forms with suffixes שְׁמַדִּי, שְׁמַדִּי (appeared to represent plurals).

² But for דְּרָכַיְתִי Prov. 28, 6. 18 (which the Masora takes as two roads leading from the cross-ways) דְּרָכַיְתִי is to be read.

§ 89. The Genitive and the Construct State.

Philippi, *Wesen und Ursprung des Stat. Constr. im Hebr.* Ein Beitrag zur Nominalflexion im Semitischen überhaupt, Weimar, 1871, p. 98 sqq.: on which cf. Nöldeke in the *Göttingische Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, p. 23.

- a 1. The Hebrew language no longer makes a living use of *case-endings*¹, but indicates the *relations of case* externally, either not at all (this is so for the *nominative*, generally also for the *accusative*) or by means of prepositions (§ 119), while the *genitive* relation is mostly indicated by a close connexion (or interdependence) between the *Nomen regens* and the *Nomen rectum*. That is to say, the noun which as genitive serves to define more particularly an immediately preceding Nomen regens, remains entirely unchanged in its form. The close combination, however, of the governing with the governed noun, causes the tone first of all to be forced on to the latter², and the consequently weakened tone of the former word, then usually involves further changes within it. These changes to some extent affect the consonants, but more especially the vocalization, since vowels which had been lengthened by their position *in or before* the tone-syllable necessarily become shortened, or are reduced to vocal Š'wā (comp. § 9. a, c, k; § 27. e-m); e.g. דָּבָר דְּבָרִים word of God (a sort of compound, as with us in inverted order, *God's-word*, in German *Gotteswort*, *housetop*, *landlord*); יָד הַמֶּלֶךְ the hand of the king; דְּבָרִים הָעָם words of the people. Thus in Hebrew only the noun which stands *before a genitive* suffers a change, and in grammatical language is said to be dependent, or in the *construct state*, while a noun which has not a genitive after it is said to be in the *absolute state*. It is sufficiently evident from the above that the *construct state* is not strictly to be regarded as a *syntactical* and *logical* phenomenon, but rather as simply *phonetic* and *rhythmical*, depending on the circumstances of the tone.

- b Very frequently such interdependent words are also united by *Maqqeph* (§ 16. a); this, however, is not necessary, but depends on the accentuation in the particular case. On the wider uses of the *constr. st.* see the *Syntax*, § 130.

¹ On some remains of obsolete case-endings see § 90.

² The same phenomenon of the tone may also be easily seen in other languages, when two words are closely connected in a similar way. Observe, for example, in German the natural stress on the last word in '*der Thron des Königs*'; though here the other order of the words (inadmissible in Hebrew) '*des Königs Thron*' exhibits the same peculiarity.

§ 90.] *Probable Remains of Early Case-endings.* 259

2. The *vowel* changes which are occasioned in many nouns by the *construct state* are more fully described in §§ 92-95. Moreover, the *terminations* of the noun in the *construct state* sometimes assume a special form. Thus: (a) In the *construct state*, plural and dual, the termination is '—, e. g. סוסים *horses*, סוסים פרעה *the horses of Pharaoh*; עינים *eyes*, עיני המלך *the eyes of the king*.

Rem. The '— of the dual has evidently arisen from '— (cf. ימים), but the origin of the termination '— in the *constr. st. plur.* is disputed. The Syriac *constr. st.* in *ay* and the form of the plural noun before suffixes (סוסים, סוסיה, &c., § 91. h) would point to a contraction of an original '—, as in the dual. But whether this *ay* was only transferred from the dual to the plural (so Olshausen), or is to be regarded as the *abstract, collective* termination, as in מלכה (letter *f*) and חור (so Philippi, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1890, col. 419), must be left undecided.

(b) The original ת— is regularly retained as the *feminine termination* in the *construct state* sing. of those nouns which in the *absolute state* end in ת—, e. g. מלכה *queen*, מלכת שבא *the queen of Sheba*. But the *feminine endings* ת—, ת—, and also the *plural ending* ת—, remain unchanged in the *construct state*.

(c) Nouns in ת— (cf. § 75. e) from verbs ראה (§ 93, Paradigm III, c) form their *constr. st.* in ת—, e. g. ראה *seer*, constr. ראה; probably this ת— is due to contraction of the original '—, with ה added as a vowel letter. The same contraction occurs in רי, constr. רי *sufficiency*; חי, constr. חי *life*; נח (נח), constr. נח (נח) *valley*.

On the terminations י and '— in the *constr. st.* see § 90.

§ 90. *Probable Remains of Early Case-endings, ת— local, '— and י in the Construct State.*

K. U. Nylander, *Om Kasusändelserna i Hebräiskan*, Upsala, 1882.

1. As the Assyrian and old Arabic distinguish three cases by special endings, so also in the Hebrew noun there are three endings which, in the main, correspond to those of the Arabic. In Hebrew, however, they have for the most part lost their original signification, and hence can only be regarded now as decayed fragments of a fuller and more vigorous organic period, since the language, in the condition in which we find it in the Old Testament, no longer distinguishes the cases by terminations.

b In Assyrian the rule is that *u* marks the nominative, *i* the genitive, and *a* the accusative, 'in spite of the many and various exceptions to this rule which occur' (Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*, § 66). Similarly, the Arabic case-endings in the fully declined nouns (*Triptotes*) are: *-u* for the nominative, *-i* for the genitive, and *-a* for the accusative; in the *Diptotes* the ending *-a* represents the genitive also. In modern Arabic these endings have almost entirely disappeared, and if they are now and then used, as among the Bedāwi, it is done without regularity, and one is interchanged with another (Wallin, in *ZDMG.* v. p. 9, xii. p. 874; Wetzstein, *ibid.* xxii. p. 113 sq., and especially Spitta, *Gramm. des arab. Vulgärdialekts von Aegypten*, Leipz. 1880, p. 147 sqq.). Even as early as the Sinaitic inscriptions, their regular use is not maintained (Beer, *Studia Asiatica*, iii. 1840, p. xviii; Tuch, *ZDMG.* iii. 139 sq.). Ethiopic has preserved only the *-a* (in proper names *-Ad*), which is, however, still used for the whole range of the accusative, and also (the distinction of case being lost) as a termination of the *constr. st.* to connect it with a following genitive.

c 2. The accusative relation is preserved in Hebrew most clearly in the (usually toneless) ending הַ־, which is appended to the substantive:

(a) Most commonly to express *direction towards* an object, or *motion to a place*¹, e.g. יָמָה sea-ward, westward, מִזְמָה eastward, צָפוֹנָה northward, אֲשׁוּרָה to Assyria, בָּבֶלָה to Babylon, הָרָה (from הָר) to the mountain, Gen. 14, 10, אֶרֶצָה to the earth, בֵּיתָה to the house, תִּרְשָׁה to Tīrṣah (תִּרְצָה) 1 Ki. 14, 17 and elsewhere, עָזָה to Gaza (עֶזָה) Jud. 16, 1; with the article הַהָרָה to the mountain, הַבֵּיתָה into the house, הַחֲרָה into the chamber, 1 Ki. 1, 15; הָאֹהֶלָה² into the tent, Gen. 18, 6 and elsewhere; even with the *constr. st.* before a genitive יוֹסֵף בֵּיתָה into Joseph's house, Gen. 43, 17. 24; אֶרֶצָה הַיָּנָב toward the land of the south, Gen. 20, 1; אֶרֶצָה מִצְרַיִם to the land of Egypt, Ex. 4, 20; מִדְבָּרָה רַמְסֶס to the wilderness of Damascus, 1 Ki. 19, 15; מִזְרְחָה שָׁמֶשׁ toward the sunrising, Deut. 4, 41; and even with the plural בְּשָׂדֵיהֶם to the Chaldeans, Ezek. 11, 24; הַשָּׁמַיִם toward the heavens.

¹ On this meaning of the accusative see the Syntax, § 118. *d*, and cf. the Latin accusative of motion to a place, as in *Romam profectus est, domum reverti, rus ire*. This view of the locative as an old accusative is, however, not undisputed. Olshausen (*Lehrbuch*, § 130. *a*) considers the termination הַ־ although 'of great antiquity, a new invention' in Hebrew; in the opinion of Praetorius (*ZA W.* iii. 215 sqq.) it was originally compatible only with certain forms of the *constr. st.* (such as מִדְבָּרָה שָׁמֶשׁ, &c.) and was then secondarily transferred to the more common uses of the *constr. state* and to the *absolute state*.

² הָאֹהֶלָה in Baer's text, Gen. 18, 6, is an error, according to his preface to Isaiah, p. v.

Rem. The above examples are mostly rendered definite by the article, or by a following genitive of definition, or are proper names. But cases like *לְפָנָיו*, *הָרָחָב*, *בְּיָמָהּ* show that the locative form of itself possessed a defining power.

(b) In a somewhat weakened sense, merely indicating the place *d* where something is or happens (cf. § 118. d), e. g. *מָהָנַיִם* in *Mahanaim*, 1 Ki. 4, 14; *שָׁמָּה* there (usually *thither*), Jer. 18, 2, comp. 2 Ki. 23, 8, and the expression *to turn a sacrifice into sweet smoke* *הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*, properly *towards the altar* for *on the altar*. On the other hand, *בְּבִלָּהּ* Jer. 29, 15, and *וּבְלָהָּ* Hab. 3, 11, are to be regarded as ordinary accusatives of direction, *to Babylon, into the habitation*; also expressions like *מִצָּפוֹן* *the quarter towards the north*, Jos. 15, 5 (at the beginning of the verse, *בְּגֹבֶל הַיָּם* *the border toward the east*), comp. 18, 15. 20. Ex. 26, 18. Jer. 23, 8.

(c) The original force of the ending *הָ* is also disregarded when *e* it is added to a substantive with a preposition prefixed, and this not only after *לְ*, *אֶל* or *עַד* (which are easily explained), e. g. *לְמַעַלָּהּ* *upwards*, *לְמַטָּהּ* *downwards*, *לְשָׂאוֹלָהּ* *to Sheol*, Ps. 9, 18; *עַד־אַפְּהֵקָהּ* *unto Aphēq*, Jos. 13, 4, *אֶל־הַצָּפוֹן* *toward the north*, Ezek. 8, 14, comp. Jud. 20, 16; but also after *בְּ*, and even after *מִן*, e. g. *בְּיָנֵבָהּ* *in the south*, Jos. 15, 21, comp. Jud. 14, 2. 1 Sam. 23, 15. 19. 31, 13. 2 Sam. 20, 15. Jer. 52, 10; *מִבְּבִלָּהּ* *from Babylon*, Jer. 27, 16; comp. 1, 13. Jos. 10, 36. 15, 10. Jud. 21, 19. Is. 45, 6.

Rem. Old locative forms (or original accusatives) are, according to the Masora, *f* still to be found in

(a) *לַיְלָהּ*, in *pause* *לַיְלָה*, the usual word in prose for *night*, which is always construed as masculine. The nominative of this old accusative appeared to be preserved in the form *לַיְלָה*, only used in poetry, Is. 16, 3, *constr. st.* *לַיְלָה* (even used for the *absol. st.* in *pause* Is. 21, 11). Most probably, however, *לַיְלָהּ* is to be referred, with Nöldeke and others, to a reduplicated form *לַיְלִילָהּ*; cf. especially the western Aramaic *לַיְלִיָּהּ*, Syr. *lilya*, &c. If the final vowel belongs to the ground-form, the Masoretic marking of the tone on the penultima is inexplicable. —Another instance is *מֵאֲמָהּ* *something*, probably from *מָאָם*, *מָאָם* *spot, point*, generally with a negative = *nothing*. Similarly *אֲרָצָהּ* Is. 8, 23 and (in *pause*) Job 34, 13, *מִסְפָּרָהּ* Hos. 8, 7, and the place-name *הַיָּדָהּ* Jos. 21, 36, might be explained as accusatives. Elsewhere, however, the toneless *הָ* can be regarded only as a meaningless appendage, or at the most as expressing poetic emphasis; thus *אֲרָצָהּ* (in *pause*) Job 37, 12; *הַמָּוֶתָהּ* *death*, Ps. 116, 15; *נַחֲלָהּ* *stream*, Ps. 124, 4; *הַחֲשֵׁמֶלָהּ* *amber*, Ezek. 8, 2 [in 1, 4 *הַחֲשֵׁמֶל*, cf. § 80. k]. In Jos. 15, 12 *הַיָּדָהּ* is probably only a scribal error (dittography). In Jud. 14, 18 instead of the quite unsuitable poetic word *הַחֲרָסָהּ* (towards the sun??) read according to 15, 1 *הַחֲרִירָהּ* *to the bride-chamber*.

g (b) In the termination הָֿ often used in poetry with feminines, viz. אִי־תָה terror (= אִי־מָה), Ex. 15, 16; עֲזָרָה help (= עֲזָרָה), Ps. 44, 27. 63, 8. 94, 17; יִשְׁעָה salvation (= יִשְׁעָה), Ps. 3, 3. 80, 3. Jon. 2, 10; עֲוִיָּה unrighteousness, Ezek. 28, 15. Hos. 10, 13. Ps. 125, 3; עֲלָה Ps. 92, 16 *Keth.* Job 5, 16; צָרָה Ps. 120, 1; עִי־פָה darkness, Job 10, 22; הַמִּצְפָּה Jer. 11, 15 is corrupt, see the LXX and Commentaries. These cases are not to be taken as double feminine endings, since the loss of the tone on the final syllable could then hardly be explained, but they are further instances of an old accusative of direction or intention. In examples like עֲזָרָה for help (Ps. 44, 27) this is still quite apparent, but elsewhere it has become meaningless and is used merely for the sake of poetical emphasis¹.

h This termination הָֿ usually has reference to *place* (hence called הָֿ *locale*); sometimes, however, its use is extended to time, as in יָמִים מִיָּמָה from year to year; probably also (in spite of the tone on the ultima) in עַתָּה now, at this moment (from עָתָה). Its use in חֲלִילָה , properly *ad profanum*! = *absit*! is peculiar.

i As the termination הָֿ is properly toneless (comp., however, עֲזָרָה above, מִזְרָה *constr. st.* Deut. 4, 41; נִתָּה and עֲתָה Jos. 19, 13, &c.) it generally, as the above examples show, exercises no influence whatever upon the vowels of the word; in the *constr. st.* מִזְרָה Jos. 18, 12. 1 Ki. 19, 15, and in the proper names נִתָּה 1 Ki. 2, 40, דָּנָה 2 Sam. 24, 6, צִפְרָה 2 Chron. 14, 9, צִרְפָּה 1 Ki. 17, 9, צִרְיָה 1 Ki. 4, 12, the *ā* is retained even in an open tone-syllable (comp., however, הָרָה Gen. 14, 10, פְּדָה Gen. 28, 2 from פָּדָן , with half lengthening of the *a* to *ē*; also פְּרָמָה 1 Sam. 25, 5 from פְּרָמָל). In segholate forms, as a general rule, the הָֿ *local* is joined to the already developed form of the *absol. st.*, except that the helping-vowel before הָֿ naturally becomes vocal *Swd.*, e. g. פְּרָמָה , הָאֵהָלָה Gen. 18, 6, and elsewhere; הָעֵרָה Jos. 17, 15, הָשְׁעָה Jud. 20, 16, &c., but also נָחָה Num. 34, 5 (*constr. st.*; likewise to be read in the *absolute* in Ezek. 47, 19. 48, 28) and שְׁעָה Is. 28, 6 (with *Silluq*); comp. נִנְבָה Ezek. 47, 19 and נִרְנָה (Baer, incorrectly, נִרְנָה) Mic. 4, 12 (both in *pause*).—In the case of feminines ending in הָֿ the הָֿ *local* is added to the original feminine ending תָֿ (§ 80. b), the *ā* of which (since it then stands in an open tone-syllable) is lengthened to *ā*, e. g. הָרָצָה .—Moreover the termination הָֿ is even weakened to הָֿ in נֹבָה to *Nob*, 1 Sam. 21, 2. 22, 9; אָנָה *whither*, 1 Ki. 2, 36. 42 and דִּדְנָה to *Dedan*, Ezek. 25, 13.

[¹ The form clings also to a few place-names, as נִרְנָה Deut. 10, 7; שְׁלִישָׁה 1 Sam. 9, 4. 2 Ki. 4, 42; קִהְלָה Num. 33, 22 sq.; יִמְפָּה verse 33 sq.; תִּמְנָה Jos. 19, 43, &c.; אִסְרָה Mic. 5, 1, &c.]

² So Qimhi, and the Mant. ed. (Text. recept. שְׁעָה), i. e. locative from שַׁעַר (Is. 7, 20).

3. Less frequent, and almost exclusively retained in poetic style, ^z is the use of two other endings, which, along with the accusative in הַ, at one time probably corresponded to the Arabic case-endings, viz. the so-called *literae compaginis* '—, the original genitive ending, and י, in proper names also י, corresponding to the Arabic nominative ending. The language is, however, *entirely unconscious* of any sense of *case* in these endings, and they remain merely as *archaic* forms, which occasionally come to be used in poetry or in exalted style, and have also been unconsciously handed down from early times in several compound proper names. In such names, as also elsewhere, these endings now occur almost exclusively in the closest connexion of one noun with another, i. e. in the *construct state* ¹.

(a) The ending '—, as has been just remarked, is especially frequent in the *constr. st.*, and almost always has the tone, viz. בְּנֵי אֲחִינוּ *his ass's colt*, Gen. 49, 11; ver. 12 חֲכָלֵי עֵינַיִם *dark red of eyes*; הַזֶּאֱמָן *that leaveth the flock*, Zech. 11, 17 (comp. the preceding רֵעִי הָאֵלִיל); שֹׁכֵנֵי סִנְיָה *the dweller in the bush*, Deut. 33, 16; appended to the feminine יוֹם וַיִּגְנַבְתִּי לָיְלָה *whether stolen by day or stolen by night*, Gen. 31, 39 (in prose, but in very emphatic speech); מְלֵאֲחֵי מִשְׁפָּט *plena iustitiae*, Is. 1, 21; עַם רַבְּתִי *full of people*, Lam. 1, 1; עַל־דְּבָרָתִי *after the manner of Melchizedek*, Ps. 110, 4. To the same category belong the rather numerous cases, in which a *preposition* is inserted between the *construct* and *absolute state* (comp. § 130. a), without actually abolishing the dependent relation, e.g. רַבְּתִי בְּגוֹיִם *she that was great among the nations*, Lam. 1, 1 (the removal of tone from the '— is here due apparently to the preceding עַם רַבְּתִי, where the retraction of the tone was required by the following tone-syllable; but comp. also ibid. שְׂרָתִי בְּמִדְיָנוֹת and אֲרֻכְתִּי לְרֹשׁ Hos. 10, 11); אֲסִירִי לְגֶפֶן *binding unto the vine*, Gen. 49, 11; comp. Ex. 15, 6 (?). Jer. 10, 17 *Kth*. 22, 23 *Kth*. 49, 16 (bis). 51, 13 *Kth*. Obad. 3. Ps. 113, 5-9 (some of these in less close connexion; in ver. 8 even with the *infinitive* [but read probably לְהוֹשִׁיבוֹ]. Lam. 4, 21 *Kth*.; perhaps also Lev. 26, 42 (ter); Jer. 33, 20 (bis); Ps. 116, 1).

¹ In other ancient combinations of words also, old endings are often retained which have elsewhere disappeared, or become rare, e.g. the feminine ending הַ in the *constr. st.* (§ 89. e), and in the verb before suffixes (§ 59. a). In the same way various archaic forms have been preserved in proper names and in poetry.

^m Otherwise than in the *construct state*, *Hireq compaginis* is also found in Is. 22, 16 (bis). Ezek. 27, 3 *Kith*. Mic. 7, 14. Ps. 101, 5. 114, 8. 123, 1. Moreover, with a few particles, which are properly nouns in the *construct state*, as *וְיָלְתִּי* (= *וְיָלַת*) *besides*, *כִּנִּי* (poet. = *כִּן*) *from*, *וְלֹא בְלִי* *not*, *וְלֹא אִמְסִי* *not* (thrice in the formula *אֲנִי וְאִמְסִי עוֹד* *I am, and there is none else beside me*) Is. 47, 8. 10. Zeph. 2, 15. [The above are all the cases in which this '— is attached to independent words in the O. T.; it occurs, however, besides] in compound proper names, as *מֶלֶךְ צֶדֶק* (*king of righteousness*), *גִּבְרִיָּאל* (*man of God*), *חַנּוּכָּאל* (*favour of God*), and others (comp. also the Punic name *Hannibal*, i. e. *חַנְיָבָעַל* *favour of Ba'al*).

ⁿ (b) The ending *־י* (always with the tone) is of much rarer occurrence, and is found in prose only once, and then in elevated style, Gen. 1, 24 *חֵית הָאָרֶץ* *the beast of the earth* (= *חֵית הָאָרֶץ* ver. 25); in poetry, in the same word, Ps. 50, 10. 79, 2. 104, 11. 20. Is. 56, 9. Zeph. 2, 14; otherwise only in *בְּנוֹ צִפּוֹר* *son of Zippor*, Num. 23, 18; *בְּנוֹ בְּעוֹר* *son of Beor*, Num. 24, 3. 15; and *מַעְיֵנֵי מַיִם* *a fountain of waters*, Ps. 114, 8.— On the ending *־י* see the Rem.

0 Rem. Although the terminations '— and *־י* have now wholly lost their case-meaning, in all probability they at one time in the language had the force of case-endings, in the same way as *־ה* (letter *c*), especially as ancient Arabic exhibits exactly corresponding terminations as real flexional endings, and only at a later period confused or wholly rejected them (see above). The same phenomenon also recurs in other languages. In Latin, for instance, we still find a restricted use of the locative case (in names of towns, *ruri*, *domi*, &c.) with the same endings as in Sanskrit; in modern Persian the plural endings *ān* and *hā* are ancient case-terminations, which, however, no longer have any vital existence as such, not to mention the Romance and Germanic languages.—Even where the ancient Arabic incorporated the case-endings with the stem, and so pronounced them more strongly, as in *dbū*, *dbī*, *dbā* (with *dbī* comp. the Hebrew *constr. st.* *אָבִי* from *אָב* *father*), the modern language, though still using all three forms, makes no strict distinction between the three cases. Hence also, probably, in the common Hebrew *constr. st.* *אָבִי*, *אִמִּי* we have really a genitive ending; and in Western Aramaic *אָבִי*, Hebr. *אָבִי* (in proper names as *מְחִישָׁאל* and *מְחִישָׁלָה*; comp. also *בְּחִישָׁאל*, *שִׁישָׁאל*), *פָּנִי* (*פָּנִיָּאל*) a nominative ending; and this is the more intelligible as we find *פָּנִיָּאל* (Gen. 32, 31) by the side of *פָּנִיָּאל* (verse 32), and *אִמִּי* together with *אִמִּיָּלָה*.

§ 91. *The Noun with Pronominal Suffixes.*

W. Diehl, *Das Pronomen pers. suffixum 2 u. 3 pers. plur. des Hebr. in der alttestamentlichen Überlieferung*, Giessen, 1895.

With regard to the connexion of the noun with pronominal suffixes, *a* which then stand in a genitive relation (§ 33. *c*), and are, therefore, necessarily appended to the *construct state* of the noun, we shall first consider, as in the verb (§ 57 sqq.), the forms of the suffixes themselves, and then the various changes in the form of the noun to which they are attached. The nouns are also tabulated in the Paradigms of the flexion of the noun in § 92 sqq. Comp. also Paradigm A in the Appendix. We are here primarily concerned with the different forms of the suffixes when added to the singular, plural and dual.

1. *The Suffixes of the singular are—*

b

With nouns ending in *a*—

Vowel.	Consonant.
Sing. 1. <i>c.</i> א	אִי my.
2. { <i>m.</i> ה	הִי (pause הִי־) } thy.
<i>f.</i> ה	הִי
3. { <i>m.</i> הוּ ו	וִי (הִי), הוּ־ his.
<i>f.</i> ה	הִי, הִי־ her.

Vowel.	Consonant.
Plur. 1. <i>c.</i> ו	וֵנוּ our.
2. { <i>m.</i> כֶּם	כֶּם־ } your.
<i>f.</i> כֶּן	כֶּן־
3. { <i>m.</i> הֶם (poetic הֶם־)	} eorum.
(poet. הֶם) (poet. הֶם־)	
<i>f.</i> הֵן (הֵן)	הֵן־ earum.

Rem. 1. There is less variety of forms in these than in the verbal suffixes; the particular forms are used as follows:—

(*a*) Those without a connecting vowel (on the derivation of these 'connecting vowels' from original stem-vowels, see note on § 58. *f*) are joined to nouns of a peculiar form (see § 96), the *constr. st.* of which ends in a vowel, as אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ and אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ, אֲבִיךָ, sometimes also to segholate forms ending in *f* from הִי stems (see § 93. *x, y*), e. g. הֶם פְּרִיָהֶם the fruit of them, Am. 9, 14 (also פְּרִיָהֶם Is. 37, 30 and elsewhere), הֵן פְּרִיָהֶן Jer. 29, 28 (also פְּרִיָהֶן verse 5); comp., moreover, הֵן חֶלְבָהֶן Lev. 8, 16. 25 and similar examples with הֵן (Is. 3, 17 הֵן)

Gen. 21, 28. Ezek. 13, 17, 16, 53¹ (in other cases, e.g. Gen. 1, 21, 4, 4. Ezek. 10, 12. Nah. 2, 8, the Masora by the punctuation מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ avoids recognizing these suffixes as attached to singular nouns).

- d* (b) The forms with connecting vowels (§ 58. *f*) are joined to nouns ending in a consonant. The connecting vowel is regularly *a* in the 3rd *sing. fem.* מָהָרְ (for *aha*) and 3rd *plur.* מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ , also in the 3rd *sing. masc.* מָהָרְ (מָהָרְ), since the *o* is contracted from *ahā*, and in the pausal form of the 2nd *masc.* מָהָרְ (a half lengthening of an original מָהָרְ).

The forms with *e* in the above-mentioned persons are common only with nouns in מָהָרְ (from stems מָהָרְ), *constr. st.* מָהָרְ (cf. § 89. *f*), e.g. מָהָרְ (from *sadayhā*) *his field*; מָהָרְ *its leaf*, Is. 1, 30; מָהָרְ *the appearance thereof*, Lev. 13, 4 (from *mar'ay-hā = mar'āhā*, with rejection of the *Ydh* and half-lengthening of the *d* to *Sghōl* in the open tone-syllable); but מָהָרְ *her field*, from *sāda[γ]hā*. The orthographic retention of the *'*, e.g. מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ , gives to many forms the appearance of plurals; see instances in § 93. *ss*.

Apart from these מָהָרְ forms the connecting vowel *e* in the 3rd pers. occurs only in isolated cases; מָהָרְ *his light*, Job 25, 3; מָהָרְ *after its kind*, Gen. 1, 12, 21, 25 and elsewhere; Jud. 19, 24. Nah. 1, 13. On the other hand מָהָרְ in the 2nd *sing. fem.* and מָהָרְ in the 1st *plur.* are by far the most common forms, while מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ are of rare occurrence; see letter *e*.—Instead of מָהָרְ (מָהָרְ in Gen. 10, 19. Ex. 13, 16. Jer. 29, 25 and elsewhere, comp. מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ § 103. *g*), מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ (with *Swd* mobile or medium), if the last consonant of the noun is a guttural, the forms are מָהָרְ , מָהָרְ , e.g. מָהָרְ *thy spirit*, מָהָרְ *thy creator*, Is. 43, 1, מָהָרְ *your friend*, Job 6, 27 (on such cases as מָהָרְ Hag. 2, 5, see § 10. *g*).

2. Rare or incorrect forms are—

- e* *Sing. 1st pers.* מָהָרְ in מָהָרְ Ezek. 47, 7 (certainly only a scribal error, caused by מָהָרְ in verse 6).

2nd pers. m. in pause מָהָרְ , e.g. מָהָרְ (*thy hand*), Ps. 139, 5, comp. Prov. 24, 10; once מָהָרְ Ps. 53, 6 (comp. the analogous cases in the verbal suffix § 75. *h*); *fem.* מָהָרְ Ezek. 5, 12 (in 16, 53 also for מָהָרְ probably מָהָרְ is intended), מָהָרְ Jer. 11, 15. Ps. 103, 3, 116, 19, 135, 9 (corresponding to the Aramaic suffix of the 2nd *fem. sing.*; on the wholly abnormal מָהָרְ Nah. 2, 14, comp. letter *l* below). Also מָהָרְ Is. 22, 1, Ezek. 23, 28, 25, 4.

3rd pers. מָהָרְ (cf. § 7. *c*), e.g. מָהָרְ Gen. 9, 21, 12, 8, 13, 3, 35, 21 (always with *Q'rel* מָהָרְ); מָהָרְ Num. 10, 36; מָהָרְ Dent. 34, 7; מָהָרְ Jer. 20, 7. Nah. 2, 1 *Q'rel*; מָהָרְ 2 Ki. 19, 23 *K'th.*, for which מָהָרְ is read in Is. 37, 24; מָהָרְ and מָהָרְ Gen. 49, 11, cf. Ex. 22, 26 (*Q'rel* מָהָרְ , *סוֹחֵר*); מָהָרְ Ps. 10, 9, 27, 5 *K'th.*; מָהָרְ Ezek. 31, 18 and elsewhere, *K'th.*; מָהָרְ Ezek. 48, 18 [altogether fourteen times in the Pentateuch, and some forty times in other Books: see Driver, *Samuel*, p. xxxv, and on 2 Sam. 2, 9, 21, 1].

¹ Also in Jer. 15, 10 read (according to § 61. *h*, end) מָהָרְ ; in Hos. 7, 6 probably מָהָרְ for מָהָרְ .

3rd *fem.* הַ־ for הִ־ (with the softening of the *Mappiq*, comp. § 23. *k*, and the analogous cases in § 58. *g*) occurs repeatedly before *B^gghadhk^hphath* and other soft consonants, Ex. 9, 18 (before י, if the text is right), Lev. 13, 4 (before ל), Num. 15, 28. 31. 1 Sam. 1, 9. Ezek. 16, 44. 24, 6 (before ב), 1 Sam. 20, 20. 2 Ki. 8, 6. Prov. 12, 28 (before מ), Nah. 3, 9 (before י), Ps. 48, 14 (before מ), Ezek. 47, 10. Job 31, 22 twice (before ה), Is. 21, 2. Jer. 20, 17 (before ה), Num. 32, 42. Amos 1, 11 (before י), Lev. 6, 2 (before ע); even in *pause*, Lev. 12, 4 *a* and 5 *b*; Is. 23, 17. Prov. 21, 22, also with *Zaqeph*, Is. 45, 6. Jer. 6, 6 (probably), 44, 19; on הַ־ Lev. 26, 34 and elsewhere, see § 67. *γ*. Cf. also הַ־ Ezek. 36, 5. — Sometimes the Masora appears to regard the הַ־ with feminines as a shortening of הִ־, e. g. הַ־ נָצַח Gen. 40, 10 for הִ־ נָצַח Prov. 7, 8 for הִ־ נָצַח; also הַ־ for הִ־ in הַ־ בְּרִיבְנֵימֶם Hos. 13, 2, and הַ־ עָרַמְתָּ Job 5, 13. The examples, however, are for the most part uncertain, e. g. in Is. 28, 4 the reading is simply to be emended to בְּבִרְיָה, and in Zech. 4, 2 to בְּרִיָּה, Job 11, 9 to מְדִיָּה Neh. 5, 14 to מְדִיָּה.

Plur. 1st pers. הִ־, in *pause* הִ־ קִיָּמְנוּ Job 22, 20 (where, however, קִיָּמְנוּ is certainly *f* to be read); comp. Ruth 3, 2. Is. 42, 10, and so always הִ־ כָּלֵנוּ *all of us*, Gen. 42, 11 and elsewhere.

2nd pers. *fem.* הִ־ Ezek. 23, 48. 49.

3rd pers. *masc.* הִ־ Ps. 17, 10 (on הִ־ in הִ־ in the same verse, and in Ps. 58, 7 see letter *l* below); הִ־ 2 Sam. 23, 6. *Fem.* הִ־ 1 Ki. 7, 37. Ezek. 16, 53 (in *pause*); הִ־ Gen. 41, 21; הִ־ Gen. 30, 41; הִ־ Ruth 1, 19, elsewhere generally in *pause* (Gen. 21, 29. 42, 36. Jer. 8, 7. Prov. 31, 29. Job 39, 2); finally הִ־ as suffix to a noun, only in Is. 3, 17.

For examples of singulars with plural suffixes see letter *l* below.

2. In the *plural masc.* and in the *dual* the suffixes are to be regarded primarily as affixed to the original ending of the *construct state* (יָ־, comp. § 89. *d*). This ending, however, has been preserved unchanged only in the 2nd *fem.* In most cases it is contracted to יָ־, as in the *constr. st.* without suffixes (so throughout the plur.), whilst in the 2nd *masc.* and 3rd *masc.* and *fem. sing.* (except in the poetic suff. יָ־) the *Yôdh*, which has really been dropped, is only orthographically retained. The preceding *ā* is then either fully lengthened by the tone to *ā* (as in the 3rd *masc. sing.*), or is modified to tone-bearing *S^gghôl* (as in the 2nd *masc.* and 3rd *fem. sing.*). On the 1st *pers. sing.* see below, letter *i*.—Thus there arise the following

Suffixes of Plural Nouns.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>	<i>h</i>
1. <i>c.</i> יָ־, <i>pause</i> יָ־ <i>my.</i>	1. <i>c.</i> הִ־ <i>our.</i>	
2. { <i>m.</i> הִ־ <i>f.</i> הִ־, <i>pause</i> הִ־ } <i>thy.</i>	2. { <i>m.</i> הִ־ <i>f.</i> הִ־ } <i>your.</i>	
3. { <i>m.</i> הִ־, poet. הִ־ <i>his.</i> <i>f.</i> הִ־ } <i>her.</i>	3. { <i>m.</i> הִ־, poet. הִ־ <i>f.</i> הִ־ } <i>their.</i>	

i Thus the original '— is (a) contracted in the 3rd *sing. masc.* וְהָיָה and throughout the *plural*, as מִיָּסִינִי , מִיָּסִינִי , &c.; (b) retained unchanged in the 1st *sing.* מִיָּסִי , the real suffix-ending ' (see letter *b*) being united with the final *Yôdh* of the ending '—; and in the 2nd *fem. sing.* מִיָּסִיָּהּ , with a *helping-Hireq* after the *Yôdh*. On the other hand (c) the *Yôdh* of '— is lost in pronunciation and (a) the *ā* lengthened to *ā* in the 3rd *masc. sing.* מִיָּסִיָּהּ , i. e. *sūsāw* (pronounced *sūsā-u*); or (β) *ā* is modified to tone-bearing *S°ghôl* in the 2nd *masc. sing.* מִיָּסִיָּהּ from *sūsākhā*, and in the 3rd *fem. sing.* מִיָּסִיָּהּ from *sūsāhā*.

k Rem. 1. The fact that *ai* elsewhere is always contracted to *i* is against deriving מִיָּסִיָּהּ , &c., from *susai-ka*, &c.; cf. the analogous cases of the impf. of verbs וְהָיָה , § 75. *c* and *f*. Since the *Yôdh* in these suffixes (except in the 1st *sing.* and 2nd *fem. sing.*) is retained only orthographically, it is occasionally omitted¹, although this in unpointed writing easily caused confusion with the *sing. noun*, e. g. דְּרָכָיִךְ for דְּרָכֶיךָ *thy ways*, Ex. 33, 13. Jos. 1, 8. Ps. 119, 37; for other examples, see Jos. 21, 11 sqq. (מִנְּדָרָיִךְ ; but in 1 Chron. 6, 40 sqq. always מִנְּדָרֶיךָ) Jud. 19, 9. 1 Ki. 8, 29. Is. 58, 13. Ps. 119, 41. 43. 98 (probably, however, in all these cases the *sing.* is intended); רַעֲיָהוּ for רַעֲיָהוּ *his friends*, 1 Sam. 30, 26. Prov. 29, 18; Job 42, 10 (it is, however, possible to explain it here as a *collective singular*); מִסִּרְיָהּ Num. 30, 8; מִסִּרְיָהּ Jer. 19, 8. 49, 17; מִסִּרְיָהּ Dan. 11, 6; עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ *our iniquities*, Is. 64, 5. 6. Jer. 14, 7; Ex. 10, 9. Neh. 10, 1; נִסְכָּבָם Num. 29, 33; רַעֲוָתָם Jer. 44, 9; רַעֲוָתָם Ps. 134, 2; לְמִינָהֶם *after their kinds*, Gen. 1, 21, comp. 4, 4 and Nah. 2, 8. The defective writing is especially frequent in the 3rd *masc. sing.* '—, which in *Qrē* is almost always changed to '—, e. g. חֲצָיו *his arrows*, Ps. 58, 8, *Qrē* חֲצָיו , and so almost invariably חֲצָיו (see the Lexicon), only three times חֲצָיו .

l 2. Unusual forms (but for the most part probably only scribal errors) are—

Sing. 2nd pers. fem. מִיָּסִיָּהּ (after מִיָּסִיָּהּ *happy!* Eccles. 10, 17, which has become stereotyped as an interjection, and is therefore unchangeable; comp. Delitzsch on the passage); מִיָּסִיָּהּ (comp. Syr. מִיָּסִיָּהּ) 2 Ki. 4, 3, and 7 in *K^{eth}*, Ps. 103, 3-5. 116, 7 (מִיָּסִיָּהּ in *pause*).—In Ezek. 16, 31 מִיָּסִיָּהּ (so מִיָּסִיָּהּ in 6, 8) occurs with an *infin.* ending in וְהָיָה , the וְהָיָה being therefore treated as a plural ending; similarly, the plural suffix is sometimes found with the feminine ending וְהָיָה (Num. 14, 33. Is. 54, 4. Jer. 3, 8. Ezek. 16, 15. 23, 7, as well as in 16, 20 *Qrē*, and Zeph. 3, 20), with the ending *ith* (Lev. 5, 24, reading חֲמִלְתָּהּ), and even with the ordinary feminine ending *ath*; Is. 47, 13. Ezek. 35, 11. Ps. 9, 15. Ezra 9, 15.—Wholly abnormal is מִלְּאֲכָהֶם *thy messengers*, Nah. 2, 14, evidently a case of dittography of the following הֵם : read מִלְּאֲכָהֶם .

¹ So in the Mēša' inscription, l. 22 מִנְּדָרָהּ *its towers* (along with שְׁעָרֶיהָ *its gates*). Can it have been the rule to omit ' after the termination *ôth*? Comp. below, letter *n*. In many of the above examples, however, the *sing.* was certainly intended.

3rd *masc.* יָהָם Hab. 3, 10. Job 24, 23; יָהָם 1 Sam. 30, 26. Ezek. 43, 17. Nah. 2, 4; יָהָם (a purely Aramaic form) Ps. 116, 12.—3rd *fem.* יָהָם Ezek. 41, 15.

Plur. 2nd pers. *masc.* יָהָם (with *t*, so Qimhi; comp. Norzi: the word is, however, really corrupt) Jer. 25, 34; *fem.* יָהָם Ezek. 13, 20.

3rd *masc.* יָהָם Ezek. 40, 16; *fem.* יָהָם Ezek. 1, 11.

3. The termination יָהָם (also with the dual, e.g. Ps. 58, 7. 59, 13), like מָן and מָן, occurs with the noun (as with the verb) almost exclusively in the later poets, and cannot, therefore, by itself be taken as an indication of archaic language. But even in later writings, as Diehl (see above, before letter *a*) has pointed out, it is confined to particular poets and groups: certain Psalms, Ex. 15, Deut. 32 and 33, 26-29, &c. The instances are not to be regarded as Aramaisms, but are due to the artificial use of old forms, as is shown by the evidently intentional frequency of them, e.g. in Ex. 15. Ps. 2 and 140, and also by the fact that in Ex. 15 they occur *only* as verbal suffixes, in Deut. 32 *only* as noun suffixes.

3. It is clear and beyond doubt that the *Y'dh* in these suffixes *m* with the plural noun belongs, in reality, to the ending of the *construct state* of the masculine plural. Yet the consciousness of this fact became so completely lost as to admit of the striking peculiarity (or rather inaccuracy) of appending those *suffix-forms*, which include the plural ending יָהָם, even to the feminine plural in חַיִּים (חַיִּים, &c.), so that in reality the result is a double indication of the plural¹.

Such is the rule: the singular suffix, however (letter *b*), also occurs with the ending חַיִּים (probably through the influence of Aramaic), e.g. עֲרֹחֵי Ps. 132, 12 (unless it be *sing.* for עֲרֹחֵי, as, according to Qimhi in his Lexicon, תַּחֲנוּנֵי 2 Ki. 6, 8 is for תַּחֲנוּנֵי); מַלְאָכֵי Deut. 28, 59 (treated on the analogy of an *inf.* לִי); מַלְאָכֵי Ps. 119, 98. Dan. 9, 5; מַלְאָכֵי Ezek. 16, 52. In the 3rd *plur.* this is even the rule in the earlier Books (see the instances in Diehl, l.c., p. 8), אֲבוֹתָם (*their fathers*) oftener than אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם (this only in 1 Ki. 14, 15, and in Jer., Ezra, Neh., and Chron.); so always שְׁמוֹתָם, שְׁמוֹתֵיהֶם *their names*, דּוֹרוֹתָם, דּוֹרוֹתֵיהֶם *their generations*. From parallel passages like 2 Sam. 22, 46 compared with Ps. 18, 46; Is. 2, 4 with Mic. 4, 3, it appears that in many cases the longer form in יָהָם can only subsequently have taken the place of יָהָם.

4. The following Paradigm of a masculine and feminine noun *o* with suffixes is based upon a monosyllabic noun with an unchangeable vowel. With regard to the ending חַיִּים in the *constr. st.* of the fem. it should be further remarked that the short *a* of this ending is only

¹ See an analogous case in § 87. *s.* Comp. also the double feminine ending in the 3rd *sing. perf.* of verbs יָהָם, § 75. *i.*

retained before the *grave* suffixes קם and קן; before all the others (the *light* suffixes) it is lengthened to ā.

p

Singular.

	Masculine.	Feminine.
	סוס <i>a horse.</i>	סוּסָה <i>a mare.</i>
Sing. 1. com.	סוּסִי <i>my horse.</i>	סוּסָתִי <i>my mare.</i>
2. { m.	סוּסְךָ <i>thy horse.</i>	סוּסְךָ <i>thy mare.</i>
{ f.	סוּסְךָ <i>thy horse.</i>	סוּסְךָ <i>thy mare.</i>
3. { m.	סוּסוֹ <i>equus eius (suus).</i>	סוּסָתוֹ <i>equa eius (sua).</i>
{ f.	סוּסָה <i>equus eius (suus).</i>	סוּסָתָה <i>equa eius (sua).</i>
Plur. 1. com.	סוּסֵינוּ <i>our horse.</i>	סוּסָתֵינוּ <i>our mare.</i>
2. { m.	סוּסֵיכֶם <i>your horse.</i>	סוּסָתֵיכֶם <i>your mare.</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיכֶן <i>your horse.</i>	סוּסָתֵיכֶן <i>your mare.</i>
3. { m.	סוּסֵיהֶם <i>equus eorum (suus).</i>	סוּסָתֵיהֶם <i>equa eorum (sua).</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיהֶן <i>equus earum (suus).</i>	סוּסָתֵיהֶן <i>equa earum (sua).</i>

q

Plural.

	Masculine.	Feminine.
	סוסים <i>horses.</i>	סוסות <i>mares.</i>
Sing. 1. com.	סוּסִי <i>my horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתִי <i>my mares.</i>
2. { m.	סוּסֵיךָ <i>thy horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיךָ <i>thy mares.</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיךָ <i>thy horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיךָ <i>thy mares.</i>
3. { m.	סוּסֵיוֹ <i>equi eius (sui).</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיוֹ <i>equae eius (suae).</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיהֶּ <i>equi eius (sui).</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶּ <i>equae eius (suae).</i>
Plur. 1. com.	סוּסֵינוּ <i>our horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתֵינוּ <i>our mares.</i>
2. { m.	סוּסֵיכֶם <i>your horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיכֶם <i>your mares.</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיכֶן <i>your horses.</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיכֶן <i>your mares.</i>
3. { m.	סוּסֵיהֶם <i>equi eorum (sui).</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶם <i>equae eorum (suae).</i>
{ f.	סוּסֵיהֶן <i>equi earum (sui).</i>	סוּסוֹתֵיהֶן <i>equae earum (suae).</i>

§ 92. Vowel Changes in the Noun.

- a 1. Vowel changes in the noun may be caused (a) by dependence on a following genitive, (b) by connexion with pronominal suffixes, (c) by the plural and dual terminations, whether in the form of the absolute state or of the construct (before a following genitive of a noun or suffix).

2. In all these cases, the tone of the noun is moved forward either ^b one or two syllables, while the tone of the *construct state* may even be thrown upon the following word. In this way the following changes may arise:—

(a) *When the tone is moved forward only one place*, as is the case when the plural and dual endings יִם, וֹת and יִם are affixed, as well as with all monosyllabic or paroxytone suffixes, then in dissyllabic nouns the originally short vowel of the first syllable (which was lengthened as being in an open syllable before the tone) becomes vocal *Š'wd*, since it no longer stands before the tone. On the other hand, the originally short, but tone-lengthened vowel, of the second syllable is retained as being now the pretonic vowel; e.g. דָּבָר word (ground-form *dābār*), plur. דְּבָרִים; with a light suffix beginning with a vowel, דְּבָרִי, דְּבָרֶיךָ, &c.; plur. דְּבָרַי, דְּבָרֶיךָ, &c.; with an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: כְּנָפִים *wing*, dual כְּנָפָיו. With an unchangeable vowel in the second syllable: פֶּקִיד overseer, plur. פֶּקִידִים; with the suffix of the sing. פֶּקִידִי, פֶּקִידֶיךָ, &c.; with the suff. of the plur. פֶּקִידֵי, פֶּקִידֵיךָ, &c. With an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable: עוֹלָם eternity, plur. עוֹלָמִים, with suff. עוֹלָמֵי, &c.¹

But in participles of the form קוֹטֵל, with tone-lengthened *ē* ^c (originally *ī*) in the second syllable, the *ē* regularly becomes *Š'wd* mobile before a tone-bearing affix, e.g. אֹיֵב enemy, plur. אֹיְבִים, with suff. אֹיְבֵי, &c. Likewise in words of the form קָטַל, &c. (with *ē* in the second syllable; § 84 *b*, letters *d*, *l*, *p*; § 85. *i* and *k*), e.g. אֵלֶם dumb, plur. אֵלִים.

(b) When the tone of the *construct state*, plural or dual, is carried ^d over to the following word, or, in consequence of the addition of the grave suffixes to the *constr. st.* plur. or dual, is moved forward two places within the word itself, in such cases the originally short vowel of the second syllable becomes vocal *Š'wd*, while the vowel of the first syllable reverts to its original shortness, e.g. דְּבָרֵי הָעָם the words of the people, דְּבָרֶיךָ your words, דְּבָרֵיהֶם their words (in all which instances the *ī* of the first syllable is attenuated from an original *ā*).

¹ The participles *Niph'al* נִדְּחָה Deut. 30, 4, נִדְּחוּ 2 Sam. 14, 13, and some plurals of the participle *Niph.* of verbs א"ל form an exception; comp. § 93. *oo*.

e In the segholate forms in the singular the suffix is always appended to the ground-form (מֶלֶךְ *my king*, מֶלֶכְךָ, &c.); on the other hand, before the endings ים, וֹת (sometimes also before יםִּי) a *Qames* regularly occurs¹, before which the vowel of the first syllable then becomes vocal *Ṣewd* (מֶלֶכִּים, מְלָכֹת). This *Qames* (on which comp. § 84*a*, letter *a*) remains even before the light suffixes, when attached to the plur. masc. (מֶלֶכִּי, מְלָכֶיךָ &c.). On the other hand, the *constr. st.* plur. and dual, regularly, according to letter *d*, has the form מְלָכֵי, with grave suffix מְלָכֵיכֶם &c., דְּלָתַי from דְּלָתִים *folding-doors*.

f (c) Before the *Ṣewd mobile* which precedes the suffix הַ when following a consonant, the *a*-sound, as a rule, is the only tone-lengthened vowel which remains in the final syllable (being now in an open syllable *before* the tone), e.g. דְּבַרְךָ, דְּבַרְהֶם, &c. (on the forms with *ē* in the second syllable, see § 93. *qq*); but before the grave suffixes כֶּם and כֶּן in the same position it reverts to its original shortness, as דְּבַרְכֶם (*d'bhār-khēm*), &c. In the same way the tone-lengthened *ā* or *ē* of the second syllable in the *constr. st.* sing. also becomes short again, since the *constr. st.* resigns the principal tone to the following word, e.g. דְּבַר אֱלֹהִים; חֲצֵר הַפֶּיִת; (from חֲצִיר).

g Rem. The Masora (comp. *Diqduqe ha-ṣ'amim*, p. 37) reckons thirteen words which retain *Qames* in the *constr. st.*, some of which had originally *d* and, therefore, need not be considered. On the other hand, אֵלֶם or אֵלֶם 1 Kl. 7, 6. Ezek. 40, 48, &c. (in spite of the *constr. st.* plur. אֵלֶםִּי מְבַכֶּה Ps. 65, 6. Prov. 25, 19; מֵצֵב 1 Sam. 13, 23 (so Baer, but ed. Mant., Ginsburg, &c. מֵצֵב); מִשְׁקֶל Ezra 8, 30 and מִשְׁקֶן Prov. 18, 16 are very peculiar.

h 3. The vowel changes in the inflexion of *feminine nouns* (§ 95) are not so considerable, since generally in the formation of the feminine either the original vowels have been retained, or they have already been shortened to vocal *Ṣewd*.

i Besides the vowel changes discussed above in letters *a-g*, which take place according to the general formative laws (§§ 25-28), certain further phenomena must also be considered in the inflexion of nouns, an accurate knowledge of which requires in each case an investigation of the original form of the words in question (see §§ 84-86). Such are, e.g., the rejection of the הַ of לְהַ stems before all formative additions (comp. § 91. *d*), the sharpening of the final consonant of ע' stems in such cases as חָקִי, חָקִי, &c.

k There is this striking difference between the vowel changes in the verb and

¹ For the rare exceptions see § 93. *i* and § 97. *f*, first note.

noun, namely, that in a verb when terminations are added, it is mostly the second of two changeable vowels which becomes vocal *šwā* (שָׁוָה, שָׁוָה, שָׁוָה), but in a noun, the first (דָּבָר, דְּבָרִים), comp. § 27. 3.

§ 93. *Paradigms of Masculine Nouns*¹.

Masculine nouns from the simple stem may, as regards their form *a* and the vowel changes connected with it, be divided into four classes. A synopsis of them is given in the following table, and they are further explained below. Two general remarks may be premised:

(a) That all feminines without a distinctive termination (§ 122. *h*) are treated like these masculine nouns, e.g. חֶרֶב *f. sword*, like מֶלֶךְ *m. king*, except that in the *plural* they usually take the termination וֹת—; thus חֲרָבוֹת, *constr.* חֲרָבוֹת (and so always before *suffixes*, see § 95).

(b) That in the plural of the first three classes a changeable vowel *ō* is always retained before the light suffixes as a lengthened pretonic vowel, whenever it also stands before the plural ending יִם—. All suffixes, except כֶּם, כֵּן, הֶם, הֵן (יָכֶם—, יָכֵן—, יָהֶם—, יָהֵן—), are called *light*. Comp. § 92. *e*.

¹ A sort of detailed commentary on the following scheme of Hebrew declensions is supplied by E. König in his *Hist.-krit. Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, ii. 1 (see above, § 3. *f*).

Paradigms of

I.						
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מֶלֶךְ (king)	סֵפֶר (book)	קֹדֶשׁ (sanctuary)	נָעַר (a youth)	נֶצַח (perpetuity)	פֶּעַל (work)
„ <i>construct</i>	מֶלֶךְ	סֵפֶר	קֹדֶשׁ	נָעַר	נֶצַח	פֶּעַל
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מַלְכִי	סִפְרִי	קֹדְשִׁי	נַעְרִי	נִצְחִי	פַּעְלִי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מַלְכְּךָ	סִפְרְךָ	קֹדְשְׁךָ	נַעְרְךָ	נִצְחְךָ	פַּעְלְךָ
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַלְכִּים	סִפְרִים	קֹדְשִׁים	נַעְרִים	נִצְחִים	פַּעְלִים
„ <i>construct</i>	מַלְכֵי	סִפְרֵי	קֹדְשֵׁי	נַעְרֵי	נִצְחֵי	פַּעְלֵי
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מַלְכֵי	סִפְרֵי	קֹדְשֵׁי	נַעְרֵי	נִצְחֵי	פַּעְלֵי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מַלְכֵיכֶם	סִפְרֵיכֶם	קֹדְשֵׁיכֶם	נַעְרֵיכֶם	נִצְחֵיכֶם	פַּעְלֵיכֶם
<i>Dual absolute</i>	רַגְלַיִם (feet)	קַבְצִיִּם (two heaps)	מִתְנַיִם (loins)	נַעְלַיִם (sandals)		
	[proper name.]					
„ <i>construct</i>	רַגְלֵי		מִתְנֵי	נַעְלֵי		

II.						
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	דָּבָר (word)	חָכָם (wise)	זָקֵן (an old man)	כְּתֹף (shoulder)	חֲצֵר (court)	שָׂדֶה (field)
„ <i>construct</i>	דָּבָר	חָכָם	זָקֵן	כְּתֹף	חֲצֵר	שָׂדֶה
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרִי	חֲכָמִי	זָקֵנִי	כְּתָפִי	חֲצֵרִי	שָׂדֵי
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרְךָ	חֲכָמְךָ				שָׂדְךָ
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	דְּבָרִים	חֲכָמִים	זָקֵנִים		חֲצֵרִים	
„ <i>construct</i>	דְּבָרֵי	חֲכָמֵי	זָקֵנֵי		חֲצֵרֵי	
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	דְּבָרֵי	חֲכָמֵי	זָקֵנֵי		חֲצֵרֵי	
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	דְּבָרֵיכֶם	חֲכָמֵיכֶם	זָקֵנֵיכֶם		חֲצֵרֵיכֶם	
<i>Dual absolute</i>	כְּנָפִים	חֲלָצִים	יָרֵכִים			
	(wings)	(loins)	(thighs)			
„ <i>construct</i>	כְּנָפֵי					

Masculine Nouns.

I.						
<i>g.</i>	<i>h.</i>	<i>i.</i>	<i>k.</i>	<i>l.</i>	<i>m.</i>	<i>n.</i>
מָוֹת (death)	זַיִת (olive)	שׁוֹט (whip)	פֵּרִי (fruit)	יָם (sea)	אִם (mother)	חֹק (statute)
מוֹת	זֵית	שׁוֹט	פֵּרִי	יָם, יָם	אִם	חֹק
מוֹתִי	זֵיתִי	שׁוֹטִי	פֵּרִי	יָמִי	אִמִּי	חֻקִּי
מוֹתֶךָ	זֵיתְךָ	שׁוֹטְךָ	פֵּרֶיךָ	יָמוֹךְ	אִמְךָ	[חֻקְךָ]
מוֹתֶכֶם	זֵיתְכֶם	שׁוֹטְכֶם	פֵּרִיכֶם	יָמְכֶם	אִמְכֶם	[חֻקְכֶם]
[מוֹתֵינוּ]	זֵיתֵינוּ	שׁוֹטֵינוּ	פֵּרֵינוּ	יָמֵינוּ	אִמּוֹתֵנוּ	חֻקֵּינוּ
מוֹתִי	זֵיתִי	שׁוֹטִי	פֵּרִי	יָמִי	אִמּוֹתִי	חֻקִּי
	זֵיתִי	שׁוֹטִי	(kids)	יָמִי	אִמּוֹתִי	חֻקִּי
	זֵיתְכֶם	שׁוֹטְכֶם		יָמְכֶם	אִמּוֹתֵיכֶם	חֻקְכֶם
	עֵינַיִם	יוֹמִים	לְחָיִים	כַּפָּיִם	שִׁנָּיִם	
	(eyes)	(two days, biduum)	(cheeks)	(hands)	(teeth)	
	עֵינִי		לְחָיִי	כַּפִּי	שִׁנָּיִי	

III.			IV.		
<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>c.</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>b.</i>	<i>c.</i>
עוֹלָם (eternity)	אֵיב (enemy)	חֹה (seer)	פֹּקֵד (overseer)	עָנִי (poor)	כָּתֵב (writing)
עוֹלָם	אֵיב	חֹה	פֹּקֵד	עָנִי	כָּתֵב
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹי	פֹּקֵדִי		כָּתֵבִי
עוֹלְמְךָ	אֵיבְךָ	חֹיךָ	פֹּקֵדְךָ		כָּתֵבְךָ
עוֹלְמְכֶם	אֵיבְכֶם	חֹיכֶם	פֹּקֵדְכֶם		כָּתֵבְכֶם
עוֹלְמֵנוּ	אֵיבֵנוּ	חֹיֵנוּ	פֹּקֵדֵנוּ	עָנִיֵּנוּ	[כָּתֵבֵנוּ]
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹי	פֹּקֵדִי	עָנִי	[כָּתֵבִי]
עוֹלָמִי	אֵיבִי	חֹי	פֹּקֵדִי		[כָּתֵבִי]
עוֹלְמֵיכֶם	אֵיבְכֶם	חֹיכֶם	פֹּקֵדֵיכֶם	עָנִיכֶם	[כָּתֵבֵיכֶם]
מְלִמָּה	מֵאֻנָּה		שָׁבָעִים		
(pair of tongs)	(balance)		(two weeks)		
	מֵאֻנִּי				

Explanations of the Paradigms (see pp. 274, 275).

- c* 1. Paradigm I comprises the large class of *segholate* nouns (§ 84 *a*, letters *a-e*). In the first three examples, from a strong stem, the ground-forms *mālēk*, *sīphr*, *qūdš* have been developed by the adoption of a helping *S'ghōl* to מַלְכִּי (with *ā* modified to *ē*), סִפְרִי (*i* lengthened to *ē*), קִדְשִׁי (*ū* lengthened to *ō*). The next three examples, instead of the helping *S'ghōl*, have a helping *Pathah*, on account of the middle (*d, f*) or final guttural (*e*). In all these cases the *construct state* coincides exactly with the *absolute*. The singular suffixes are added to the ground-form; but in *c* and *f* an *ō* takes the place of the original *ū*, and in *d* and *f* the guttural requires a repetition of the *ā* and *ō* in the form of a *Haṭeph* (חֲטֵפֶה, חֲטֵפֵי); before a following *S'wd* this *Haṭeph* passes into a simple helping vowel (*ā, ō*), according to § 28. *c*; hence חֲטֵפֶה, &c.
- d* In the plural an *a*-sound (which, according to § 84 *a*, letter *a*, is most probably original) appears before the tone-bearing affix דָּ, in the form of a pretonic *Qameṣ*, whilst the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal *S'wd*. This *Qameṣ* again in the *construct state* becomes vocal *S'wd*, so that the short vowel under the first radical then stands in a half-closed syllable (מִלְכִּי, not מִלְכִּי, &c.). On the other hand, the pretonic *Qameṣ* of the *absolute state* is retained before the light plural suffixes, whilst the grave suffixes are added to the form of the *construct state*.—The ending of the *absolute state* of the dual is added, as a rule, to the ground-form (so in *a-d* and *h*, but comp. *k*). The *construct state* of the dual is generally the same as that of the plural, except, of course, in cases like *m*.
- e* Paradigms *g* and *h* exhibit forms with middle *u* and *i* (§ 84 *a*, letter *c, γ* and *δ*); the ground-forms *maut* and *sail* are always contracted to *mōt*, *sēt*, except in the *absol. sing.*, where *u* and *i* are changed into the corresponding consonants ו and י.
- Paradigm *i* exhibits one of the numerous forms in which the contraction of a middle *u* or *i* has already taken place in the *absol. sing.* (ground-form *šaut*).
- Paradigm *k* is a formation from a stem מִלְכִּי (§ 84 *a*, letter *c, e*)
- f* Paradigms *l, m, n* are forms from stems מִלְכִּי, and hence (see § 67. *a*) originally biliteral, *yam*, 'im, *huq*, with the regular lengthening to

occurs in בְּנָדִי, &c. from בָּנָד and יִבְנֶה Deut. 15, 14. 16, 13, in both cases evidently owing to the influence of the palatal in the middle of the stem. With *S^gghöl* for *l*: הַבִּלִּי, יִשְׁעֶךָ, נְנִדִי, &c.

- l E. In the plural the termination וֹת is sometimes found along with the termination יִם, e.g. נִפְשֹׁת, נִפְשֹׁת, נִפְשֹׁת together with נִפְשִׁים (Ezek. 13, 20), &c., constr. נִפְשֹׁת. Other nouns have only the ending וֹת, e.g. אֲרָצוֹת, constr. אֲרָצוֹת from אֲרָץ. Without *Qames* before the ending יִם we find רַחֲמִים (*bowels*) *mercy*. On the numerals עֶשְׂרִים *twenty*, &c., comp. the note on § 97. f. Moreover a is not inserted before plural suffixes with the tone on the penultima in אֲשֶׁרֶךָ, &c., properly *thy happiness!* (a word which is only used in the constr. st., and at an early period became stereotyped as a kind of interjection), nor in יַחְדָּו *together*, according to § 135. r from יַחַד, nor with the preposition תַּחַת § 103. o.
- 11 F. In the constr. st. plural a firmly closed syllable is sometimes found, contrary to the rule, e.g. בָּסָפִי Gen. 42, 25. 35 (before suffixes); רִשְׁפִּי Cant. 8, 6 (רִשְׁפִּי Ps. 76, 4); טִרְפִּי Ezek. 17, 9; צִמְדִּי Is. 5, 10, and so always in נִסְכֵּי before suffixes, Ps. 16, 4 and elsewhere (on the other hand, according to the best authorities *not* in חֲסִדִּי Is. 55, 3 and elsewhere, though in Ps. 107, 43 Ginsburg reads חֲסִדִּי); comp. § 46. d. Even with a middle guttural בְּעֵלְיָהוּ Est. 1, 17. 20.—The attenuation of *d* to *l* also occurs very frequently in this form (see above), e.g. נִבְחִי, &c., even יִלְדִּי Is. 57, 4 beside יִלְדֵּי Hos. 1, 2 and elsewhere.
- 12 G. In the dual absol. beside forms like רַגְלַי *feet*, with suff. רַגְלֶיךָ, &c., רַגְלָיו, &c., אֲלַפִּים *two thousand*, נַעֲלָיִם *sandals*, בְּרָפִי, &c. (*d* attenuated to *l*, constr. st. בְּרָפִי with a firmly closed syllable), with suffixes בְּרָפִי, &c. (comp., however, בְּרָפִי Jud. 7, 6); forms with pretonic *Qames* are also found (in consequence of the tendency to assimilate the dual to the plural in form: so König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 17), as קַרְנֵי *horns*, with suff. קַרְנֶיךָ (Dan. 8, 3 sqq.; elsewhere always קַרְנֵי, קַרְנֵי, &c.), and so always דְּלָתַי, constr. st. דְּלָתֶיךָ *folding-doors*, דְּוַיִּם *double way*.
- o 2. On Paradigms b and c. With a final א rejected (but retained orthographically) we find חֲמָא *sin*. An initial guttural before suffixes generally receives *S^gghöl* instead of the original *l*, e.g. חֲלָקִי, עֲזָרִי, &c., so in the constr. st. plur. עֲזָרֵי, &c.; חֲמָא forms חֲמָאֵי 2 Ki. 10, 29 and elsewhere, retaining the *Qames* of חֲמָאֵי before the weak א.—On עֲשָׂבוֹת (constr. st. plur. of עֲשָׂב) Prov. 27, 25 comp. § 20. k; שִׁקְמִים without *Qames* before the termination יִם (see above, letter l) is probably from the sing. שִׁקְמָה found in the Mišna.
- p 3. On Paradigms c and f. שִׁקְמָה occurs in Prov. 22, 21 without a helping vowel; with a middle guttural פָּעַל, &c., but with ח also אָחַל, בָּהֵן; with a final guttural בָּהֵה, רָבַע, &c., but with א, אָמַה; with a firmly closed syllable אֲסַפִּי Mic. 7, 1.
- q Before suffixes the original *h* sometimes reappears in the sing., e.g. גְּדֹלָה (Ps. 150, 2), beside גְּדֹלָה, from גְּדֹל *greatness*; סִבְלוֹ (with *Dageš forte* *dirimens*, and the *h* repeated in the form of a *Heleph-Qames*) Is. 9, 3 and elsewhere; וְשִׁקְמָה Ezek. 22, 24.—Corresponding to the form מִלְכָּם *allāhām* we find קִמְכָּךְ Hos. 13, 14, even without a middle guttural; similarly קִמְנִי (so Jablonski and Opitius)

1 Ki. 12, 10. 2 Chron. 10, 10, from קָטָן *little finger*; but the better reading is, no doubt, קָטָנִי (so ed. Mant., 'the *p* proleptically assuming the vowel of the following syllable,' König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 69), and the form is to be derived, with König, from קָטָן. The reading קָטָנִי (Baer and Ginsburg) is probably not due to a confusion of the above two readings, but *־נִי* is merely intended to mark the vowel expressly as *δ*. In the forms פָּעִלְו Is. 1, 31 (for פָּעִלְו) and הָאָרֶז Is. 52, 14 (for הָאָרֶז 1 Sam. 28, 14), the lengthening of the original *ā* to *ō* has been retained even before the suffix; comp. § 63. *p* and § 74. *h* בְּמִצְאֲכֶם Gen. 32, 20).—In the same way *ō* remains before ה־ *locale*, e.g. הַרְנָה, הָאֶהֱלָה Gen. 18, 6. 24. 67 and elsewhere.

In the *absol. plur.* the original *ā* generally becomes vocal *S^{wā}* before the *Qames*, e.g. בֹּקֶר from בָּקָר *morning*, פְּעָלִים *works*, רִמָּחִים *lances*, שְׁעָלִים *handfuls* (*constr. st.* שְׁעָלִי Ezek. 13, 19); on the other hand, with an initial guttural the *u*-sound reappears as *Ḥateph Qames*, e.g. חֳדָשִׁים *months*, עֲפָרִים *gazelles*, אֲרָחוֹת *ways*; and so even without an initial guttural, הַרְנוֹת *the threshing-floors*, 1 Sam. 23, 1. Joel 2, 24; קֳדָשִׁים *sanctuaries*, קֳדָשִׁים *roots* (*qōdāštm*, &c., with *δ* for *־*); also before light suffixes קֳדָשִׁי &c., where, however, the reading frequently fluctuates between 'ק' and 'קִ'; with the article 'הַקִּ', 'בְּקִ', 'לְקִ', according to Baer and Ginsburg. Comp. further on these forms, especially § 9. *v*. From אָהֶל *tent*, both אֲהָלִים and אֵהָלִים (in the Syriac form; comp. § 23. *h* and פָּעִלְו above) are found; with light suffixes אֲהָלִי &c.; so from אֶרֶץ *way*, אֲרָחוֹתֵי (also אֲרָחוֹתִי)—hence only with initial א, 'on account of its weak articulation' (König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 45). It seems that by these different ways of writing a distinction was intended between the plural of אֲרָחוֹת *caravan*, and of אֶרֶץ *way*; however, אֲרָחוֹת is also found in the former sense (*in constr. st.* Job 6, 19) and אֲרָחוֹת in the latter (e.g. Job 13, 27 according to the reading of Ben Naphtali and Qimḥi); comp. also אוֹנִיּוֹת 2 Chron. 8, 18 *Kth*. (אֲנִי *Qrd*).—The *constr. st.* plural of בֶּהֶן *thumb* is בְּהֹנוֹת Jud. 1, 6 sq., as if from a sing. בְּהֵן: of נֹהֶה *brightness*, Is. 59, 9 נְהֹחוֹת (on these *qrdl*-forms, cf. letter *δ*).—If אֲפָנִי Prov. 25, 11 is not dual but plural (see the Lexicon) it is then analogous to the examples, given in letters *l* and *o*, of plurals without a pretonic *Qames*; cf. בִּטְנִים *pistachio nuts*, probably from a sing. בִּטְנָה. According to Barth, ZDMG. xlii. p. 345 sq. אֲפָנִי is a sing. (אֲפָנִי), the ground-form of אֲפָנִי, with suffix).

In the *constr. st. plur.* the only example with original *ā* is רִבְכֵּי Ps. 31, 21; otherwise like קֳדָשִׁי, אֲהָלִי &c.

4. Besides the forms treated hitherto we have to consider also a series of formations, which have their characteristic vowel under the *second* radical, as is ordinarily the case in Aramaic (on the origin of these forms see further, § 84 a, letter *e*). Thus (a) of the form קָטָל (comp. § 84 a, letter *e*); דְּבִשׁ *honey*, מְעַט *little*; in *pause*, דְּבִשׁ, מְעַט; גִּבֹּר *man* (as *constr. st.*, see above, letter *h*), Ps. 18, 26 (elsewhere always גִּבֹּר), and *infinitives* like שִׁבֹּב (§ 45. *c*; on קָחַת, see above, letter *h*); שִׁבֹּב *shoulder*, *δ* being modified to *ē* (but in *pause* שִׁבֹּב); locative שִׁבְכָה, also שִׁבְכָה Hos. 6, 9. With suffixes in the usual manner שִׁבְכִי, שִׁבְכָה Gen. 19, 33. 35 (an *infin.* with *S^{wā}* *medium*, not שִׁבְכָה). On the other

hand, the *ā* is retained in the *plur. absol.* by sharpening the final consonant: *אַנְפִּים* (constr. *אַנְפֵי*) *marshes*, *מְעִפִּים* *myrtles*, *מְעִפֵּים*.

- † (b) Of the form *קָטַל* *well*, *קָטַל* *wolf*, &c.; *locative* *בְּאֵרֶה*, with *suff.* *בְּאֵרֵי*, *plur.* *וְאֵרֵי*, *וְאֵרֵי*; on the other hand *בְּאֵרֶה*, *constr.* *בְּאֵרֵה*; on the *infin. constr.* *שָׂאָה*, cf. § 76. d.—(c) of the form *קָטַל* *stench* (with *suff.* *בְּאֵשׁוֹ*, as *קָטַבוֹ* occurs Jer. 4, 7 along with the *constr. st.* *קָטַבְדָּה* Ps. 74, 5; comp. for the Dageš, § 20. h), perhaps also *לְאֵם* *nation*, pl. *לְאֵמִים*.

- 11 5. Paradigms *g-i* comprise the *segholate* forms with middle *ḡ* or *ḡ*; (a) of the form *ḡdīl* with *Wāw* as a strong consonant, in which cases the original *ā* is almost always lengthened to *ā* (Paradigm *g*), thus *מָוֶה*, *מָוֶה* *vanity*, *עָוֶל* *iniquity*, *חֶמְדָּה* *midst*; with final *ā*, *שָׁמָה* *falsehood*; comp., however, also *רָחֶב* *width*. In the *constr. st.* contraction always occurs, *מָוֶה*, &c. (from original *mauāh*), and likewise before suffixes *מָוֶהוֹ*, &c. Exception, *עָוֶל* as *constr. st.* Ezek. 28, 18 (according to Qimhi) and with *suff.* *עָוֶלוֹ*. The contraction remains also in all cases in the plural (see, however, below, letter *w*).

- 12 (b) Of the form *ḡdīl* with consonantal *Yōdh* (Paradigm *h*). With final *ā*, *נִיָּא* (also *נִיָּא*), in Is. 40, 4 *נִיָּא*, in the *constr. st.* (also *absol.* Zech. 14, 4) *נִיָּא* (also *נִיָּא*); plur. 2 Ki. 2, 16 and Ezek. 6, 3 *Kth* according to Baer *נִיָּאוֹת*, i. e. doubtless *נִיָּאוֹת* (cf. *נִיָּאוֹת* Ezek. 35, 8; according to another reading [and so Ginsburg] *נִיָּאוֹת*, i. e. doubtless *נִיָּאוֹת*), but in *Qrd*, and all other passages, *נִיָּאוֹת*. The uncontracted form (in the *absol. st.* with helping *Hireq*) remains also before *ה*—*locale*, e. g. *בְּיָתָהּ* (but in the *constr. st.* e. g. *בְּיָתָהּ יוֹסֵף*).—*עִיר* (from *עִיר*) Gen. 49, 11 is peculiar, so also *שִׁיתָהּ* Is. 10, 17 (from *שִׁיתָהּ*).—In the *plural absol.* uncontracted forms occur, like *עֵינֹת* *springs*, *עֵינִים* *young asses*, *הֶעָשִׂים* *he-goats*, &c.; as *constr. st.* Prov. 8, 28 *עֵינֹת* for *עֵינִים*; comp. for an analogous weakening of *ē* to *i*, § 75. f.

- 13 (c) With the contraction of the *ḡ* and *ḡ* even in the *absol. st.*, sing. (Paradigm *i*). In this way there arise formations which are unchangeable throughout; thus from the ground-form *ḡdīl*: *יוֹם* (comp., however, § 96), *שׁוֹר*, &c.; with middle *Yōdh*, *חֵיל* 1 Chron. 9, 13 (elsewhere *חֵיל*), *לֵיל* Is. 21, 11 (elsewhere *לֵיל*), in prose *לֵילָה*, see above, § 90. f); from the ground-form *ḡlīl*, *שִׁיר*, *דִּין*, &c. The plurals (see, however, § 96); from the ground-form *ḡlīl*, *גִּיר*, *רִחַן*, &c. The plurals *חֲחִים* *pots*, *שְׁנֵים* *streets*, *שְׁנֵים* *oxen*, have a strong formation (but for *חֲחִים* 1 Sam. 13, 6 read *חֲחִים* as in 14, 11). Finally, forms with a quiescent middle *ā* also belong to this class, such as *רֹאשׁ* *head* (obscured from *רֹאשׁ* = *ra'ā*, see § 96) and *צֹאן* *sheep*.

- 14 6. On Paradigm *k*: *segholate* forms from *l'ā* stems. Besides the strong formations mentioned in § 84 a, letter *c*, *ē*, like *בְּכָה* &c., also *שָׁחוּ* Ezek. 47, 5, with the original *ḡ* resolved, according to § 24. d (comp. the *constr. plur.* *חֲגִי* *clefs*, Obad. 3 and elsewhere, and *קִצְוֵי* *ends*, Ps. 48, 11 and elsewhere, where the *ḡ* becomes again a strong consonant, from *חֲגִנוּ* and *קִצְוֵי* or *חֲגִנוּ* and *קִצְוֵי*, there occur also (a) commonly, of the ground-form *ḡdīl*, forms like *פָּרִי*, *בְּכִי*, *נָדִי*, *לָחִי*, *אֶרֶי*, &c.; in *pause* *פָּרִי*, *בְּכִי*, *לָחִי*, *אֶרֶי* (comp. § 29. m), but *אֶרֶי* Jud. 14, 18; with suffixes *פָּרִיו* (attenuated from *par-yō*), but also *פָּרִיָּהּ*, &c.;

before a grave suffix פָּרִיכֶם, but also פָּרִיכֶם. Plur. נָרִיִּים (constr. נָרִיִּי, see above, letter *o*, חֲסֵאִי, אֲרִיִּים and אֲרִיֹּת; with softening of the *y* to *ay* (as elsewhere in בְּלֹאִי Jer. 38, 12, for which there is בְּלֹאִי in verse 11, according to § 8. *k*; עֲרֵבִיאִים 2 Chron. 17, 11, comp. 26, 7 *Kth*, probably in דִּדְרָאִים לְלֵאֹת, from דִּדְרִי and דָּלִי; also חֲלֻכָּאִים Ps. 10, 10 *Kth*, divided into two words by the Masora, is to be referred to a sing. חֲלֻכִּי *hapless*): חֲלֻכָּאִים *jewels*, Cant. 7, 2 (from חֲלִי טָלָאִים *lambs*, 1 Sam. 15, 4. Is. 40, 11 (from טָלִי); but instead of פְּתָאִים and צָבָאִים (from פָּתִי and צָבִי) the Masora requires פְּתָאִים and צָבָאִים; dual: לְחַיִּים, constr. *st.* לְחַיִּי, with suff. לְחַיִּי &c. On דֶּל *door*, cf. § 95. *f*, and on such formations generally, see Barth on biliteral nouns in *ZDMG.* 1887, p. 603 sqq., and *Nominalbildung* (isolated nouns), p. 1 sqq.

(*b*) From the ground-form *qāḥ*, חָצִי *half*, in pause חָצִי, with suff. חָצִי &c.—*y* From stems with middle *Wāw* arise such forms as אֵי (from *īw* = אֵאִי), עֵי, צֵי *ship*, plur. אֵיִים, צֵיִים &c.; instead of the extraordinary plur. צֵים Num. 24, 24 read with the Samaritan אֵיִים, and for בָּצִים Ezek. 30, 9 read probably with Cornill אֵצִים.

(*c*) From the ground-form *qāḥ* sometimes forms like תָּרֹו, בָּרֹו (from *tāhw*, *bāhw*), sometimes like חָלִי, עָנִי, and even without an initial guttural יָפִי, דָּמִי, צָרִי (also דָּמִי, יָפִי, צָרִי), &c.; in pause חָלִי &c., with suff. חָלִי, plur. חָלִיִּים. From עֵפֶס *branch*, there occurs in Ps. 104, 12 the plur. עֵפְסָאִים (analogous to פְּתָאִים &c., see above, letter *x*); the *Kth* obviously intends עֵפְסָאִים (so Opitius and others). Dual, with suff. דְּלִי Num. 24, 7 from דְּלִי, for דְּלִי *bucket*.

7. On Paradigms *l-n*: segholate forms from stems ע'ע' (see § 84 *a*, letter *c*, *β*). *aa*

(*a*) In the *qāḥ*-form the *ā* of the contracted formation is sometimes lengthened in the *absol. st. sing.*, as in יָם (so also in the *constr. st.*, except in the combination יַם־סוּף *the Red sea*; and even before *Maggeph*, יַם־הַמֶּלַח *the salt sea*), sometimes it remains short, e.g. מֶסֶת *morsel*, עַם *people*, but even these formations generally have *Qameṣ* in pause, as well as after the article (e.g. הָעַם). Adjectives of this class (formerly treated under letter *f*) are, e.g. דָּל *poor*, קָל *light*, plur. דָּלִים, קָלִים; under the influence of a guttural either forms like לְחַיִּים arise, or, with *compensatory lengthening*, רָעִים, רָעִי. In the *constr. st.* חַי *life*, and דִּי *sufficiency*, are contracted to יָחִי and דִּי. As a locative form notice הָהָרָה *to the mountain*, Gen. 14, 10 (see § 27. *g*) beside הָהָרָה. The stem is expanded to a trilateral form in הָרָרִי Jer. 17, 3 (on the analogy of the *qāḥ*-forms; but in Ps. 30, 8 for הָרָרִי read הָרָרִי and הָרָרִי Gen. 14, 6; plur. *constr.* הָרָרִי Num. 23, 7, &c. (but only in poetical passages); עֲשָׂמִים Jud. 5, 14. Neh. 9, 22; עֲשָׂמִי Neh. 9, 24; elsewhere עֲשָׂים, עֲשִׂי.—Before *suffixes* and in the plur. *ā* is some-

¹ חַי only in Dan. 12, 7 as *constr. st.*; since in the asseverative formulae חַי נִפְשְׁךָ, חַי (otherwise only in 2 Sam. 15, 21, after יהוה, and Amos 8, 14) חַי is a contracted form of the *absol. st.* (prop. *living is Pharaoh!* &c.), in use along with the equally regular חַי אֲנִי (Deut. 32, 40) and חַי יהוה (= חַי אֲנִי).

times attenuated to *t*, e.g. פָּתִים, פָּתִים, from פָּת; סָפִים and סָפֹת (also סָפֹת 2 Sam. 17, 28) from סָפ. Before פ *d* is retained in a virtually sharpened syllable, e.g. פָּתִים *traps*.

bb (b) *Qāṭl*-forms: אֵשׁ, אֵשׁ *fire* (with suff. אֵשִׁי, but comp. also אֵשְׁכֶם Is. 50, 11), חֵן *favour*, &c.; of a triliteral form, the plur. חֲצִצִּיךְ Ps. 77, 18. (c) *Qāṭl*-forms: חָל, חָל *totality*, before *Maqqeph* חָל־חָל, with suff. חָלִי &c., with omission of *Dageš forte* (according to § 20. m) always חָלִי, חָלִי, חָלִי (חָלִי and חָלִי are bracketed in the Paradigm as being simply analogous formations on the model of חָלִי, חָלִי, חָלִי, for which חָלִי and חָלִי are also found). חָלִי, expanded to a triliteral form, Jud. 5, 15 and Is. 10, 1, generally explained as a secondary form of חָלִי with abnormal weakening of the *d* to *t*, is more probably to be referred to a *qāṭl*-form = Arabic *hiqq*.

cc The forms with assimilated middle *Nān* likewise follow the analogy of Paradigms *l-n*, e.g. אָנֹס *nose*, אָנֹס *angor* (אָנֹס, אָנֹס, also *face*) for 'anp; חָל *palate* for *hink*, חָל *setters*, חָל *goat*, plur. חָלִי, for 'ins, probably also חָל *green herb*, for 'inb.

dd 2. Paradigm II comprises all formations with original short vowels, whether in the first or second syllable; comp. § 84 a, letters *f-i*, and the general laws of formation, § 92. *b-g*.

Rem. 1. On Paradigms *a* and *b*: ground-form *qāṭl*. The lengthening of the *d* to *ā* is maintained in the *constr. st.* sing. only in אָל־forms, e.g. צָבָא *army*, צָבָא. For the construct forms חָלִי *milk*, חָלִי *white*, Gen. 49, 12, instead of the ordinary *absolutes* חָלִי, חָלִי, a secondary form חָלִי, חָלִי must be assumed; from חָלִי *smoke*, the *constr. st.* חָלִי occurs once, Ex. 19, 18, beside חָלִי. The plur. חָלִי *horses*, Is. 21, 7 (instead of חָלִי, ground-form *pārd*) is no doubt due to a confusion with the *qāṭl*-form חָלִי *horseman*.

ec Sometimes a sharpening of the third radical takes place, in order to keep the preceding vowel short, e.g. חָלִי *camels*, חָלִי *small ones*, חָלִי *brooks* (see § 20. a).—The attenuation of the *d* of the first syllable to *t* does not take place in the *constr. st.* plur. before a middle guttural, e.g. חָלִי; nor (according to König, owing to the influence of the nasal) in the non-guttural forms חָלִי *tails*, חָלִי, and (in the dual) חָלִי *wings*, from חָלִי, חָלִי.—The dual חָלִי from חָלִי *river*, shows an abnormal omission of the lengthening of the *d* before a tone-bearing termination.

ff B. From ע'ע' stems, forms like חָלִי, עָנִי, &c. belong to this class.

gg C. The few nouns of the ground-form *qāṭl* follow the same analogy, such as חָלִי *heart*, חָלִי *temetum*, חָלִי *grape*, &c. From חָלִי *hair*, besides the *constr. st.* חָלִי the form חָלִי is also found (perhaps a survival of a secondary form like those in Paradigm I, *d*); so from חָלִי *rib*, חָלִי and even חָלִי 2 Sam. 16, 13, both, probably, also old secondary forms (also used for the *absol. st.*) of חָלִי; comp. also חָלִי and חָלִי, as well as the *constr. st.* plur. חָלִי; also from חָלִי *strangeness*, the *constr. st.* חָלִי is found, Deut. 31, 16.

2. On Paradigms *c-e*: ground-form *qātāl*, developed to *qātāl*, with a final *hh* guttural, e.g. שָׂבַע *satisfied*. In the *constr. st.* the original *l* of the second syllable, probably on the analogy of the forms discussed in § 69. *c*, becomes *d*, e.g. וָקָן, חָרַל, חָסַר, &c., but not before suffixes, כָּתַפִּי, &c., nor in forms from לֵא stems, e.g. מָלֵא *full*, מָלֵא; comp., moreover, עָקַב Gen. 25, 26 from עָקַב *heel*, and אָבֵל Ps. 35, 14, *mourning*. Paradigm *d* represents forms which in the *constr. st.* instead of the ordinary בָּתַח, &c., have a segholate form, as אָרַךְ, נָדָר, יָרַךְ, גָּל, עָל (Ezek. 44, 9), *constr. st.* of אָרַךְ *long*, נָדָר *wall*, יָרַךְ *thigh*, גָּל *robbery*, עָל *uncircumcised*. In Is. 11, 14 בָּתַח would be altogether without precedent as a *constr. st.* (for בָּתַח); most probably the *absol. st.* is intended (wrongly) by the Masora (according to Nöldeke, *Gött. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, No. 23 [p. 896] אָחַד בכ' *with one shoulder*, i. e. *shoulder to shoulder*); cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 190, *Obs.*

In the plur. *constr. st.* the *ē* lengthened from *l* is frequently retained in verbal *ii* adjectives of this formation, e.g. שָׁכַח, שָׁמַח, שָׁמַח, חָפַץ, חָפַץ; comp. also יִתְרָתִי (under the protection of the secondary tone) from יָתַר *sent-peg*. On the other hand from יָרַא *fearing*, always יָרַא; comp. also רָנַץ Ps. 35, 20 from רָנַץ.—With *d* retained in the initial syllable comp. אָחַר *alius* (with a virtual sharpening of the ח).—From ע' stems come forms like מֵת *dead person*, גֵּר *resident stranger*, עֵד *witness*, with unchangeable *Šerē*; hence מָתִים, מָתִים, &c.

Kindred in character are the formations from the ground-form *qātāl*. This *kk* ground-form is regularly lengthened to *qātāl*, e.g. עָל *round*, עָמַק *deep*, אָרַם *red*; on the other hand before formative additions the short *d* returns, protected by the sharpening of the following consonant (see letter *ee* above), as עָנָלִים, &c. (but in stems with a third guttural or ר, נָבָה, שָׁחִים). The form עָנָל, i Ki. 10, 19, is abnormal; likewise עָמָק Prov. 23, 27, Jablonski (Baer and Ginsburg עָמָק).

3. On Paradigm *f*: ground-form *qātāl* from ל' stems. As in verbs ל' § 75. *h*, *ll* the general rule is that before the terminations of the plur. and dual and before suffixes beginning with a vowel, the third radical is usually elided altogether. But besides שָׁרָה the form שָׁרִי, with the final *Yōdh* retained, is also found in poetry; in the same way final *l* is retained in עָנִים *the poor*, *constr. st.* עָנִי. The plur. of שָׁרָה is שָׁרוֹת, *constr. st.* שָׁרוֹת (also שָׁרִי, unless this is a *sing.*, contracted from שָׁרִי; so Barth, *ZDMG*. xlii. p. 351). The *qātāl*-form (see § 84*a*, letter *i*) רָעָה 2 Sam. 15, 37, 16, 16. i Ki. 4, 5 is remarkable as a *constr. st.* (the reading רָעָה of Opitius and others is opposed to the express statement of the Masora). To the category of these forms also belongs without doubt פָּנִים *face* (only in *plur.*), פָּנִי, פָּנִי, &c.

In a few formations of this kind the vowel of the second syllable appears to have *mm* been already lost in the *absol. st. sing.*; so according to the ordinary view, in יָד *hand*, *constr. st.* יָד, with *suff.* יָדוֹ, but יָדָם; plur. יָדוֹת, *constr. st.* יָדוֹת, dual יָדָי, with *suff.* יָדִי, יָדִיכֶם, &c., and in דָּם *blood*, *constr. st.* דָּם, with *suff.* דָּמִי, but דָּמָם (*d* attenuated to *l*), plur. דָּמִים, דָּמִי. But perhaps both these nouns are to be regarded as primitive (§ 81), and as original monosyllabic formations.

3. Paradigm III comprises forms with an unchangeable vowel *nn* in the first syllable, whilst the vowel of the second syllable has been

lengthened from an original short vowel, and is therefore changeable. The special cases are to be distinguished in which the original short vowel is lengthened both *in* and *before* the tone, but in an open syllable becomes vocal *Šwā* (Paradigm *a*, to which examples like **אֲוָנִים** *wheels*, for **אֲוָנִים**, comp. **אֲלָפִים** *porches*, are to be referred), the cases in which the vowel becomes vocal *Šwā* even *before* the tone (Paradigm *b*), and finally, those in which the termination of the *ל"ה* formations of this class is entirely lost (Paradigm *c*).

- 00 Rem. 1. On the model of **עֹלָם** (which, moreover, is obscured from *'ālam*), the following forms are also inflected: **מִקְטָל** (§ 85. *k*), in some cases with virtual sharpening of the third radical (see § 20. *a*), as **מִבְּחֹזוֹ** Jer. 17, 7. Ps. 40, 5. Job 8, 14, &c.; **ל"ה** nouns of this form maintain the *Qameṣ* in the *constr. st. plur.*, e. g. **מִקְרָאִי** from **מִקְרָא**¹; on the other hand, in the plur. of the *participles Niph.* (§ 85. *n*) of verbs **ל"ה** (which likewise belong to this class), are found not only regular forms like **נִקְרָאִים** but also **נִתְבָּאִים** Jos. 10, 17, **נִתְבָּאִים** Ezek. 20, 30 sq., and so always **נִתְבָּאִים** (except Ezek. 13, 2 **הַנִּתְבָּאִים**) and **נִתְבָּאִים** (except Ezra 8, 25 **הַנִּתְבָּאִים**).

pp Moreover, the other participles in *ā* also follow the analogy of **עֹלָם** as regards the final syllable (**מִקְטָל**, **מִקְטָל**; comp., however, **הַמְדֹשֵׁב** Gen. 43, 12 in close connexion; see the analogous cases in § 65. *d*); also **שִׁלְחָן** *table* (§ 85. *u*; plur. **שִׁלְחָנוֹת**, *constr. שִׁלְחָנוֹת*), **קָרְבֵּן**, *constr. קָרְבֵּן*, hence in plur. *constr.* with *suff.* **קָרְבָּנִים** Lev. 7, 38; **עֲקָרָה** (§ 85. *w*), plur. **עֲקָרִים** (with sharpening of the final consonant for *constr. plur.*, comp. also **עֲרִים** *naked*, plur. **עֲרִימִים** Gen. 3, 7 [but in 2, 25 **מְעִטִּים** from **עָרִים**, *constr. plur. מְעִטִּים*, 2 Chron. 28, 15; **קָרְבָּנוֹת**, *constr. plur. קָרְבָּנוֹת* Is. 51, 10, **נִבְרָאִי** Is. 23, 8 sq.; even with attenuation of the *ā* to *i*, **מִוִּרְגִּים**, *threshing instruments*, 2 Sam. 24, 22. 1 Chron. 21, 23, from **מִוִּרְגָּן** (§ 85. *g*), **מִנְּן** (§ 85. *i*), **מִעֵז** (§ 85. *k*), inasmuch as they retain the *ā* of the first syllable, contrary to rule, even when not pretonic, e. g. **מִנְּנִי**, **מִעֵזִי**, **מִוִּשֵׁב** (§ 85. *g*), **הַמְדֹשֵׁב** (§ 85. *p*), *constr. st. plur. הַמְדֹשֵׁבִי* 1 Ki. 17, 1; finally, also isolated forms according to § 84 *a*, letter *t*, and § 84 *b*, letters *b, c, k, m, n, o*. Cf. further, **צִוְאָר** *neck* (from *šāw'ār*), *constr. st. plur. צִוְאָרִי Jer. 28, 10 sq., *constr. st. plur. צִוְאָרִי* Gen. 45, 14, &c.*

- qq 2. (Paradigm *b*; comp. § 84 *a*, letter *s*.) Instead of the original *t* in such forms as **אֲבִיבָהֶם** (cf. 2 Ki. 22, 29), the second syllable more frequently has *z*, e. g. **אֲבִיבָהֶם** *thy creator*; with a closing guttural (according to § 91. *d*); but cf. also **אֲבִיבָהֶם** Deut. 32, 28) forms are found sometimes like **אֲבִיבָהֶם**, sometimes like **אֲבִיבָהֶם**, *constr. st. without suff. נִתְבָּאִים* Ps. 94, 9 (according to § 65. *d*); with a middle guttural **אֲבִיבָהֶם** Is. 48, 17; comp. 43, 14.—The same analogy also is followed in the flexion of the other participles which have *z* in the final syllable (**מִקְטָל**, **מִקְטָל**, &c.); see further, in § 84 *b*, letter *d*, **נִבְרָאִי**, &c. (but with exceptions, as **שִׁלְחָנִים**, **רִבְעִים**),

¹ **מִקְרָאִים** Ezek. 7, 24 for **מִקְרָאִים** (from **מִקְרָאִים**) is wholly irregular; perhaps, however, the *part. Pi'el* is intended, without *Dageš* in the *ק* (according to § 20. *m*).

and letters *l, p*; § 85. *i, k* (מִזְבֵּחַ altar, constr. st. מִזְבְּחִים plur. מִזְבְּחִים), and letter *q*, but here also there are exceptions like מִסְכָּהִים Pa. 26, 12.

3. (Paradigm *c*: *part. Qal* of verbs ל"ה, differing from Paradigm II, *f* in the rr unchangeableness of the vowel of the first syllable.) In Ezek. 17, 15 *ē* in the *absol. st.* is abnormal, and *S^gghdl* in the *constr. st.* in 2 Sam. 24, 11 (so Opatius, Ginsburg; but Baer חֲנָה, Eccles. 2, 15 (according to Baer, but not the Mantua ed.; מִסְכָּה Eccles. 3, 19 is in the *absol. st.*). To this class belong, as regards their formation, the ל"ה-forms mentioned in § 84 *a*, letter *r*, § 85. *g* (with *suff.*, e. g. הִפְעֵלְךָ Deut. 20, 1, which brought thee up), and letter *h*.

In a few instances, before a suffix beginning with a consonant, the original *dy* of *SS* the termination has been contracted to *l*, and thus there arise forms which have apparently *plural suffixes*; as מִשְׁתִּיחֵיהֶם Is. 5, 12. Dan. 1, 10, 16; מִרְאֵיהֶם their appearance, Dan. 1, 15. Gen. 41, 21, cf. Nah. 2, 5; נוֹטְיָהֶם who stretched them forth, Is. 42, 5; defectively אֶפְהֶם Hos. 7, 5 (comp. נִהָם Ezek. 34, 14); on the other hand, the examples from Is. 14, 11. Gen. 47, 17. 1 Sam. 19, 4, which were formerly classed with the above, are really plurals. But מַחֲנֵיךְ thy camp, Deut. 23, 15 (מַחֲנֶה occurs just before), מִקְנֵיךְ thy cattle, Is. 30, 23, מִרְאֵיךְ Cant. 2, 14, and מִרְאֵיךְ the sight of him, Job 41, 1 (with the *י* here retained orthographically), מַעֲלֵיךְ Ezek. 40, 31, &c., are still to be explained as singulars.—On a few other examples which may perhaps be thus explained, see § 124. *z*. Before the plural ending the original termination *ay* reappears in מִסְתִּיחֵי Is. 25, 6 (*part. Pu.* from מִתָּה).

4. Paradigm IV comprises the forms with a changeable vowel *tt* (*a, b*), or a vowel which has already become vocal *S^wd* (*c*), in the first syllable, and an unchangeable vowel in the second. With Paradigm *c* (which, however, for the most part consists merely of forms based on analogy, without biblical parallels) are also connected all the forms which have unchangeable vowels in both syllables, and therefore (like בָּתֵּב) cannot undergo any vowel changes.

Rem. 1. Analogous to מִקְיָד (ground-form *pāqda*) are § 84 *a*, letter *k*, uu מִקְיָד, &c. (with *θ*, not changeable *ō* for *ā*); in substantives like שְׁלֹם, this *θ* is demonstrably obscured from *ā* (Arab. *salām*); letters *l, m*, מִסְכָּה, מִסְכָּה, &c.; § 85. *u*, וְכָרֶן, constr. וְכָרֶן; חֲצִיץ, constr. חֲצִיץ; כְּפִיץ, constr. כְּפִיץ (comp., however, the forms in the *constr. st.* עֲצָבוֹן, קִנְיָנוֹן, and with plural suffix עֲצָבוֹנֵיךְ Ezek. 27, 12 sqq.); § 85. *w*, חֲלָמִישׁ, constr. חֲלָמִישׁ; § 85. *l*, מִקְסוֹם, &c.

2. עֲנִי (ground-form *ʾanty*, stem עֲנָה) represents forms in which a closing *Yddh* vv *uu* has been resolved into *f*; before formative additions the *Yddh* under the protection of a *Dageš forte* again becomes audible as a firm consonant, whilst the (originally short) vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal *S^wd*; comp. § 84 *a*, letter *l*, נָקִי, plur. נְקִיִּים, and § 87. *a*.

3. בָּתֵּב with unchangeable *ā* in the second syllable, whilst the *S^wd* is weakened ww from a short vowel (Arab. *ḥidāb*); *constr. st.* בָּתֵּב. "בָּתֵּב Est. 4, 8 (readings like בָּתֵּב 2 Chron. 35, 4 are incorrect, although יֵב Est. 1, 4 and בָּתֵּב 4, 8 are supported

by fairly good authority; however, these *qîl*-forms in Hebrew are probably all loan-words from the Aramaic). The plural forms are given in the Paradigm within brackets, since they are not found in the Old Testament. In a narrower sense the forms enumerated in § 84 *a*, letters *n-p*, belong to this class; in a wider sense all those which have unchangeable vowels throughout, thus § 84 *a*, letter *u*, § 84 *b*, letter *e* (קָטַל, comp., however, the anomalous forms mentioned there), letters *f-i, m* (No. 34 sq.), *n* (No. 39), *p* (No. 44), also partly § 85. *b-w* (especially letters *l* and *r*).

xx In opposition to the anomalous shortening of the form קָטַל (see above), cases are also found where pretonic vowels are retained even in the ante-penultima (with the secondary tone); comp. above, letters *ii* and *pp*, also of the form קָטַל (properly *qđlfl*) the examples סָרִיסִים, פָּרִיצִים, שְׁלִישִׁים, whilst the constr. *st.* sing. according to the rule, changes the *ā* into vocal *š* (סָרִיס, פָּרִיץ, שְׁלִישׁ). (These are not to be confounded with forms like עֲרִיץ *tyrant*, which is for עָרִיץ, and consequently has an unchangeable *Qames*.) Of the form קָטַל (*qđlfl*) in this class, are שָׁבַע *week*, plur. שָׁבָעִים and שְׁבָעוֹת, constr. שְׁבָעוֹת, but with *Meheg* of the secondary tone in the fifth syllable from the end, שְׁבָעוֹתֶיכֶם.

§ 94. Formation of Feminine Nouns.

- a* 1. The feminine ending הַ, when appended to the masculine forms treated in § 93, effects in almost all cases the same changes as are produced in the masculine forms by the addition of a light suffix, since in both cases the tone is moved one place farther forward (see § 92. *b*). The following scheme is based on the same division into four classes, with their subdivisions, as in § 93; a few special forms will be treated in § 95 in connexion with the paradigms of feminine nouns.
- b* Paradigm I: segholate forms, with the feminine ending always added to the ground-form, (*a*) מַלְכָּה *queen*, מַבְשָׁה, and with attenuation of *ā* to *i* רַבִּישָׁה *lamb*, רַצְפָּה *hot stone*, Is. 6, 6 (elsewhere always רַצְפָּה; see Baer on Ezek. 40, 17), חֲזָקָה *strength* (unless belonging to Paradigm *b*); (*b*) סִתְרָה *covering* (masc. סִתֵּר), not to be confounded with the unchangeable forms with a prefixed ט, derived from לִי' stems, as טִצְחָה *command*, plur. טִצְחוֹת; עֲדָנָה *grace, pleasure* (עֲדוֹן); (*c*) חֲלִידָה, proper name (חֲלִיד *mole*), אֲכָלָה *food* (אָכַל); (*d*) נַעֲרָה *girl* (נָעַר); (*e*) בְּאִשָּׁה *weed*, טְהָרָה *purity* (טָהַר); (*f*) עֲוִלָּה *wrong* (also עוֹלָה, Paradigm *i*); (*g*) צִידָה *victuals* (masc. צִיד, comp. Paradigm *h*); from *qîl* and *qufl*-forms, בִּינָה *understanding*, סוּפָה *tempest*; (*k*) אֲלִיָּה *fat tail* (as if from אָלִי, שְׁבָיָה (*ā* attenuated to *i*) *captivity* (שָׁבַי), לֵוִיָּה *wreath* (probably an original *qîl*-form); (*l*) חַיָּה *life*, מִדָּה *measure* (attenuated from מִדָּה); adjectives derived from ע' ע' stems also belong in flexion

to this class, as *רַבָּה* *multa*, with middle guttural *רָעָה* *mala*; (*m*) *וְפָה* *plan*; (*n*) *חָפָה* *statute* (חח).

Paradigm II: ground-form *qātālūt*, &c., (*a*) *נָקָמָה* *vengeance* (נקם); (*b*) *אֶרֶץ* *earth*; (*c*) *נֶבֶלָה* *corpse*; (*d*) *עֵיפָה* *languida*; (*f*) *יָפָה* *beautiful*, *קֶצֶה* *end* (from *יָפָה*, *קֶצֶה*). From stems ע"י arise such forms as *עֵרָה* (masc. ער, properly *part. Qal* from ע"ר) *female witness*. From the ground-form *qātūl*, *עֲמִיקָה* *profunda* (masc. עמלס), *עֲבָדָה* *servitude*, &c.

Paradigm III: unchangeable vowel in the first, changeable in the second syllable, (*a*) *יֵלְדָה* *a woman with child* (comp. the examples in § 84 *a*, letter *s*, and the retention of the *ē* in the *part. Pi'el*, Ex. 22, 17. 23, 26; in the *Hithpa'el*, 1 Ki. 14, 5 sq.), but also with the change of the *ē* (originally *i*) into *ō*, *יֹשְׁבָה* *dwelling*, Nah. 3, 8. However, in these participial forms the feminine is mostly indicated by חֲ- (see below, letter *h*); (*c*) *וּלְדָה* *those of the captivity* (masc. וּלְדָה), but also with a recurrence of the final *Yōdh*, *חֲסִידָה* *clamorous*, Prov. 7, 11, and the examples in § 75. *v*. On the *d* of the participles of verbs ע"י, which also belong to this class, such as *וֹרָה* *peregrina*, comp. § 72. *g*.

Paradigm IV: original changeable vowel in the first syllable, *e* unchangeable in the second, (*a*) *וּלְדָה* *magna*, *חֲסִידָה* *stork*, properly *pia*; *בְּתוּלָה* *virgin*, properly *seiuuncta*; (*b*) *עֲנִיָּה* *misera*.

2. A simple ח is added as feminine ending in forms like *בְּכִיתָ* *f weeping* (masc. בָּכִי, § 93. I, *k*), *בְּרִית* *covenant*; but *feminine participles* of verbs ל"א, as *יָצְאתָ*, *מוֹצְאתָ*, may be due to contraction from *yōš'et*, &c., whilst forms like *נִשְׂאתָ*, *מוֹצְאתָ* (see § 74. *i*) may be explained on the analogy of the forms treated in § 93. *i*. Apart from the ל"ה formations, the only examples with simple ח are *יִלְדָה* (*construct st.*) Gen. 16, 11. Jud. 13, 5. 7 for *יֹלְדָה* (Gen. 17, 19. Is. 7, 14), and *מִשְׁרַת* 1 Ki. 1, 15, contracted from *מִשְׁרַתָּה*; comp. § 80. *d*.

The forms which arise by appending the ח feminine to masculine *g* nouns with a changeable vowel in a closed final syllable are, as a rule, developed exactly in the same way as masculine segholate forms. Thus there arise in Paradigm I (*a*) from *גְּבִירָה* (for original *g^ebirt*; § 69. *c*), the form *גְּבִירָתָה* *mistress* (but only in *construct st.*; the *absolute st.* is *גְּבִירָה*); from *מַלְכָּה* (מַלְכָּה = מַלְכָּה) *queen*; in Paradigm II, (*a*) *יָבֵם* *levir*, fem. *יָבֵמָה* (from *יָבֵמָה*); *פִּיתָה* (פִּיתָה = פִּיתָה) *pit* Lev. 13, 55; (*c*) *גִּירָה* *wall*, *גִּירָתָה* (from *גִּירָתָה* = *g^edirt*; comp. וְזָן as *construct st.* of וְזָן); on the other hand, *חֲמִישָׁה* is *construct st.* of *חֲמִישָׁה*, with lengthening of the original *i* of *חֲמִישָׁה*.

h Formations with a changeable *ō* in the second syllable belonging to this class are, *חֲזָה* *bronze* (from *חֲזָה*); perhaps also *חֲזָה* *writing* (unless it be obscured from *חֲזָה*, § 93, Paradigm IV, *c*).—Paradigm III, (a) *חֲזָה* (from *חֲזָה*), masc. *חֲזָה* *seal*; (b) *חֲזָה* (properly *sucking*) *sprout* (in *pause*, e.g. *חֲזָה* Ex. 26, 4, &c.), and so most feminines of the participle *חֲזָה*. On this transition of the ground-form *qōtill* to *חֲזָה* (*חֲזָה*, *חֲזָה*, see above), cf. § 69. *c*; *qōtill* regularly serves as the ground-form before suffixes, and under the influence of a guttural, e.g. *חֲזָה*, feminine of *חֲזָה* *knowing*; in a wider sense, *חֲזָה* *skull* may also be included here, see § 95, Paradigm IV, *c*.

On the endings *חֲזָה* and *חֲזָה*, see § 86. *h*, *l*, § 95 at the end.

§ 95. Paradigms of Feminine Nouns.

a In accordance with the general formative laws, stated in § 92. *b-k*, the following cases have chiefly to be considered in the flexion of feminines also: (1) a tone-lengthened vowel on the removal of the tone reverts to its original shortness (thus the *ā* of the termination *חֲזָה* becomes again *ā* in the *construct st.* *חֲזָה*). On the other hand, even an originally short vowel is retained as (a long) pretonic vowel before the ending *חֲזָה*, e.g. *חֲזָה*; (2) without the tone or foretone an originally short vowel almost always becomes vocal *Ṣwā*; on the other hand, before a vowel which had thus become vocal Ṣwā the *ā* in the first syllable which had hitherto also been reduced to vocal *Ṣwā* returns, although usually attenuated to *i*, e.g. *חֲזָה* from *ṣādhāqāth*; (3) in the plural of the feminines of segholate forms before the termination *חֲזָה* or *חֲזָה*, and in formations of the latter kind also before the light suffixes, a pretonic Qames reappears, while the short vowel of the first syllable becomes vocal *Ṣwā*. This short vowel, however, returns in the *construct st.*, whether ending in *חֲזָה* or *חֲזָה*; in formations of the latter kind also before the grave suffixes.

The following Paradigms deal only with such of the forms treated in § 94 (with the exception of I, *d*) as incur some vowel changes or other. All forms with unchangeable vowels follow the analogy of Paradigm I, *d*.

	I.					b
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	מַלְכָּה (queen)	חֲרָפָה (reproach)	חֲרָבָה (waste)	חֲקָה (statute)	גִּבְרִיחַ (mistress)	
„ <i>construct</i>	מַלְכַּת	חֲרַפַּת	חֲרַבַּת	חֲקַת	גִּבְרַת	
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	מַלְכָּתִי	חֲרַפָּתִי	חֲרַבָּתִי	חֲקָתִי	גִּבְרָתִי	
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	מַלְכַּתְכֶּם	חֲרַפַּתְכֶּם	חֲרַבַּתְכֶּם	חֲקַתְכֶּם	גִּבְרַתְכֶּם	
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַלְכוֹת	חֲרָפוֹת	חֲרָבוֹת	חֲקוֹת		
„ <i>construct</i>	מַלְכוֹת	חֲרָפוֹת	חֲרָבוֹת	חֲקוֹת		
„ <i>with suff.</i>	מַלְכוֹתִי		חֲרָבוֹתִי	חֲקוֹתִי		
<i>Dual absolute</i>		רִמְסָתִים (embroidery on both sides)			מַצְלָתִים (cymbals)	

	II.			III.		c
	a.	b.	c.	a.	b.	
<i>Sing. absolute</i>	צְדָקָה (righteousness)	זַעֲקָה (outcry)	שָׁנָה (year)	יוֹצֵמַת (sprout)	גִּלְגָּלַת (skull)	
„ <i>construct</i>	צְדָקַת	זַעֲקַת	שָׁנַת	יוֹצֵמַת	גִּלְגָּלַת	
„ <i>with light suff.</i>	צְדָקָתִי	זַעֲקָתִי	שָׁנָתִי	יוֹצֵמַתִי	גִּלְגָּלַתִי	
„ <i>with grave suff.</i>	צְדָקַתְכֶּם	זַעֲקַתְכֶּם	שָׁנַתְכֶּם	יוֹצֵמַתְכֶּם	גִּלְגָּלַתְכֶּם	
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	צְדָקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת	[יוֹצֵמַת]		
„ <i>construct</i>	צְדָקוֹת		שָׁנוֹת	יוֹצֵמַת	גִּלְגָּלוֹת	
„ <i>with suff.</i>	צְדָקוֹתִי		שָׁנוֹתִי	יוֹצֵמַתִי	גִּלְגָּלוֹתִי	
<i>Dual absolute</i>			שְׁפָתַיִם (lips)		[נְחֻשָׁתַיִם] (fetters of brass)	
„ <i>construct</i>			שְׁפָתַי			

REMARKS.

1. Paradigm I: feminines of segholate forms. (a) The locative of this class *d* has the form מִבְּעֵינָהּ towards Gibeah (masc. גִּבְעָה). In some cases, especially with an initial guttural, there is no means of deciding whether the form in question is to be referred to a *qāṭl* or a *qīṭl* base, e.g. חֲזָקָה strength (comp. חֲרָפָה under *b*). A dual of this form occurs in שִׁבְעָתַיִם seven times (comp. שִׁבְעַת seven, fem.).

¹ Only in Ps. 69, 10, contrary to rule, with a firmly closed syllable, comp. § 93. m.

² On שָׁנוֹת as a less frequent (poetic) form for שָׁנִים see § 87. n.

Analogous to masculine forms like **דְּבַשׁ** (§ 93. *f*) is **מִרְסָה** *myrtle*.—From masculines of the form **פָּרִי** (**לִיָּה**, comp. § 93. *I, k*) arise feminines sometimes like **מִנְהָה**, **שִׁלְחָה**, **אֵלֶיהָ** (see above, § 94. *b*), sometimes like **בְּכִיָּה** (§ 94. *f*); occasionally the final **ת** is retained before the plural ending, as if it belonged to the stem (comp. § 87. *k*), e.g. **חַנִּיתוֹת** *spears*. Forms like **נִיָּה** (comp. **אֲנִיָּה**, a *qūl* form) are derived directly from the masculine forms **נִדִּי** *kid*, **אֲנִי** *a fleet*.—(*b*) From a stem **עָץ**, **חֶפֶז** *wheat* (for **חֶנְזָה**, plur. **חֶפְזִים**).—(*c*) From **עָרְלָה** *foreskin*, the plur. *absol.* is **עָרְלוֹת** (comp. **פְּעָלִים**, § 93, Paradigm I, *f*), constr. **עָרְלוֹת**.—(*d*) Example of a feminine segholate form from a stem **עָץ** (ground-form *qāṭl*), like **חִיָּה** of the form *qāṭl*, **מִנְהָה** of the form *qāṭl*, with *δ* for *α*, **חֶזָּא** *terror*, Is. 19, 17 (Aramaic orthography for **חֶזְזָה**).

- e* (*e*) To the list of segholate forms with **ת** fem. belong also the infinitives of verbs **פָּוַע** and **פָּוַץ**, which have rejected the weak consonant at the beginning, as **שָׁבַת** (from **לָשַׁב**), **דָּעַת** (from **יָדַע**), **נָשַׁת** (from **נָבַשׁ**), as well as **נָחַת** (from **לָסַח**; comp. § 69. *m* and § 66. *b* and *g*). The infinitives of verbs **פָּוַע** are, however, also found in the form **דָּעָה**, **לָרָה**, **צָאָה**, and of the same origin also are **עָרְהָה** *congregation* (from **יָעַד**), **עֲצָה** *counsel* (from **יָעַץ**), **שָׁנָה** *sleep* (from **יָשָׁן**), constr. **עֲדָה**, **שָׁנָה**, while in the constr. forms **זָעַת** *sweat*, Gen. 3, 19 (from **זָעַע** *to flow*), and **צָאָה** *excrement*, Ezek. 4, 12, the *Sere* has remained firm.

- f* From a stem **עָץ** (cf. **בָּוֹשׁ** *to be ashamed*) is **בִּשְׁתָּה** *shame*, with suffix **יִשְׁתִּי**. From a stem **לִיָּה** (**דָּלָה**, comp., however, Barth, *ZDMG.* 1887, p. 607, who assumes a stem **יָדַל**) the masculine **דָּל** appears to have been formed after the rejection of the final *Ydh*, and afterwards the feminine **דָּלָה** *door*; in the plural **דָּלוֹת**, constr. **דָּלוֹת**, the **ת** of the termination is, however, retained (see above, letter *d*, **חַנִּיתוֹת**). In a similar way **שָׁקָה** *trough* has arisen (from **שָׁקָה**), of which the masc. must have been **שָׁקִי** = **שָׁק**; on the other hand, the plur. constr. **שָׁקָהוֹת** Gen. 30, 38 (again retaining the feminine **ת** as an apparent radical) can only be derived from a kindred form (**שָׁקָה** or **שָׁקָת**).

- g* 2. Paradigm II: ground-form *qāṭlāt*, &c., comp. § 94. *c*, Paradigm II, *a* and *b*. Analogous to the masculine forms like **קָטָן**, plur. **קָטָנִים**, we find **קָטָנָה** *parva*, &c.—The constr. forms, like **צִדְקָה** (*sidh'qāth*), are distinguished by the *S'wā* medium (§ 10. *d*) from the segholate forms, like **כִּבְשָׁת** (*kibh-sdth*). Consequently the constr. *st.* **בְּרָכָה** Gen. 28, 4 and elsewhere (from **בָּרַךְ** *blessing*), and **חֲרָדָה** 1 Sam. 14, 15 and elsewhere (from **חָרַד** *a trembling*), are abnormal.—Under the influence of a guttural (see Paradigm *b*) the original *d* is retained in the first syllable in the constr. *st.* (comp. also **אֲדָמָה** *earth*, **אֲדָמָה**); in other cases it is modified to *S'ghāl*, e.g. **עֲגָלָה** *wagon*, **עֲגָלוֹת**. Frequently from an *absol. st.* in **הָ**—the constr. is formed with the termination **ת**, e.g. **עֲטָרָה** *crown*, constr. **עֲטָרָת** (from **עָטַרָה**); along with **עֲצָרָה** *assembly*, **עֲצָרָה** is found usually, even in the *absol. st.*; **יָבֵמָה** (from **יָבַם** *levir*) before suffixes is pointed as in **יָבֵמָתִי**, and thus completely agrees with **נִבְרָה** (Paradigm I, *e*). From a stem **לִיָּה** (**אָמַן**) is formed **אָמָת** *truth* (from *'amant*, and this no doubt for an original *'amint*, § 69. *c*) before suffixes **אָמָתִי** &c.

- h* From the masc. form **קָטָל** (*qāṭl*) are formed, according to rule, **קָטָלָה** *wall*,

נִבְלָה *corpse*, constr. נִבְלָתָה; בְּהֵמָה *cattle*, constr. בְּהֵמָתָה (for בְּהֵמַתָּה). More frequently, however, the *ē* of the second syllable is retained before the termination *āth* of the *constr. st.*; thus from נִבְלָה once נִבְלָתִי Is. 26, 19, and always בְּרִכַּת בְּרִכַּתָּה *pool*, constr. בְּרִכַּתָּה; טִמְאָה *unclean*, constr. טִמְאָתִי *full*, Is. 1, 21 (with *t compaginis*, see § 90. 1), מִרְדָּתִי Job 16, 13; שְׂאֵלָתִי 1 Sam. 1, 27 and elsewhere (with syncope of the *ā*, שְׂלָתִי 1 Sam. 1, 17) also שְׂאֵלָתִי Job 6, 8.

As dual we find יְרֵכָתִים *sides* (comp. יְרֵכָתָה Gen. 49, 13, from the obsolete יְרֵכָה, *i* feminine of יָרֵךְ); the *constr. st.* יְרֵכָתִי is perhaps to be referred to a segholate form (יְרֵכָה), comp. יָרֵךְ as *constr. st.* of יָרֵךְ, unless the closed syllable be due to the analogy of בְּרִכַּתָּה and חֲרִידָה (letter *ḥ*).

In the forms with simple *t* feminine the ground-form *qāṭṭil* is developed (§ 69. c) *k* to *qātāl*, and this again regularly to קָטַלְתָּ. Thus the feminine of תָּכַר *companion* is תְּכַרְתָּה, of נָדַר fem. נְדָרָתִי besides נְדָרָה.—Of *ʿ* stems the segholate forms נָחַת *rest* and שָׁחַת *pit* (from נָחַץ, שָׁחַץ) belong to this class; Böttcher (*Gram.* i. 411) rightly distinguished the latter from שָׁחַת *corruption* (stem שָׁחַח); in the same way also נָחַת *rest* is distinct from נָחַח *a lighting down* (stem נָחַח).

The feminines of the form *qāṭṭil* from stems *ʿ*, as עָדָה *mortua*, fem. *i* *witness* (from עָדָה, *עֵד*), have likewise an unchangeable vowel in the first syllable. Comp., on the other hand, the forms from *ד'* stems mentioned above, letter *e*, such as שָׁנָה *sleep*, constr. st. שְׁנָתָה; moreover, חָמָה *anger*, constr. st. חֲמַתָּה (but חֲמַתָּה *a leathern bottle*, in pause חֲמַתָּה Gen. 21, 15, *constr. st.* חֲמַתָּה Gen. 21, 14, perhaps from a stem חֲמַח).

The feminines of the form *qāṭṭil*, like עָמָה (masc. עָמַל), maintain the original *m* *ā* by sharpening the following consonant (comp. § 93. *k*); on the other hand, by appending the fem. *n*, segholate forms arise, like נָחֲשָׁתָה, before suff. נָחֲשָׁתָם &c. Dual נָחֲשָׁתִים (placed under Paradigm III, c); comp., however, נָחֲשָׁתִי Lam. 3, 7.

A few feminines from *l'* stems (Paradigm II, c) are found with the ending *dth*, *n* due to the rejection of the final *Wāw* or *Yōdh* and contraction of the preceding *ā* with the *ā* of the termination *dth*; thus מְנָתָה *portion* (for *mānāyādh* or *mānāwādh*), קֶצֶת *end*, plur. מְנִיּוֹת (*constr. st.* Neh. 12, 47. 13, 10) מְנָאוֹת (Neh. 12, 44); קֶצֶת Ex. 38, 5; comp. 37, 8 and 39, 4 *Kth*.; on נָאִיתָ *valleys*, see § 93. *v*.—אִיּוֹת *sign* (stem אִיוָה) is obscured from אִיּוֹת, and this is contracted from *āyādh* = *āwāyādh*; plur. אִיּוֹת, with double feminine ending; comp. above, letter *f* and § 87. *k*.—The retention of the *ā* in the first syllable in אִיּוֹתִי, &c., Gen. 24, 41 and elsewhere, is abnormal.

3. Paradigm III, comp. the various forms in § 94. *d* and *f-k*. The dual *o* חוֹמָתִים *two walls*, Is. 22, 11 and elsewhere, taken directly from the plur. חוֹמוֹת, for חוֹמָתִים, is abnormal (comp. § 87. *s*, and the proper name גִּדְרָתִים Jos. 15, 36).—Among the forms resembling participles *Qal* of verbs *ʿ*, such as יָרַח (masc. *ṣ* from *adr*, hence with unchangeable *d*), must be reckoned also בָּמָה *high place* (from בָּמָה)¹, which has for its *constr. st.* plur. the pleonastic form בְּמִוְתֵי, or written

[¹ This etymology is extremely doubtful.—G. W. C.]

defectively בְּמַחֵי (see § 87. s); for this the Masora everywhere requires בְּמַחֵי, which is to be read *bām^othē* (not *bōm^othē*), with an anomalous shortening of the *o* to *ā*; with suffixes on the contrary בְּמַחֵי, &c.

- p* In a wider sense the feminines of the form קָפַל (§ 84 b, letter *e*) belong to this class, in so far as they shorten the *d* of the second syllable before the termination ת, e.g. דָּלָקַת *inflammation* (from *dallāqt*), with suff. צִדְקָתָהּ Ezek. 16, 52; טָבַעַת *signet*; also fem. of the forms קָפַל and קָפַל (§ 84 b, letters *c* and *d*), as אִלְתָּא *folly* (for *'iwudlā*), and of all the forms which have a changeable vowel in the second syllable, and are formed with the prefix כ (§ 85. *g-k*), e.g. מַמְלָכָה *kingdom*, constr. always מַמְלָכָת; מְחַמָּה (not used in the sing.) *pruning-hook*, plur. מְחַמָּוֹת; מְשַׁבֵּרַת *reward*, with suff. מְשַׁבֵּרָי; comp. also the examples given in § 85. *g* and *p*, as מוֹלְדָת *birth* (from לִי, on the other hand, מוֹצֵאֵת *outgoing*), תוֹלְדָת *generation*, תוֹעֵבָה *abomination*, constr. תוֹעֵבַת, &c.

- q* Sometimes the plural of these forms is to be traced to a secondary form, e.g. אִגָּרַת *a letter*, plur. אִגָּרוֹת (as if from אִגָּרָה); also יִנְקוֹת, which is merely formed on the analogy of the other plur. fem. of participles *Qal*, is to be referred to a sing. יִנְקָה. Comp., moreover, מְחַרְשֵׁת *ploughshare*, plur. מְחַרְשֹׁת (as if from מְחַרְשָׁה)¹; on the other hand, כְּתוּרוֹת *capitals* (of columns), and הוֹכְחוֹת *reproofs*, are the regular plurals of כְּתוּרָה and הוֹכְחָה.

- r* In בְּחִנָּת *coat* the original *h* of the first syllable is maintained by the sharpening of the following consonant (comp. Arab. *qūṭān*), with suff. בְּחִנָּתַי, the constr. st., however, is בְּחִנָּת (as also in the *absol. st.* in Ex. 28, 39); plur. בְּחִנָּוֹת, constr. בְּחִנָּוֹת.—The form בְּחִנָּת given in Paradigm III, *b* is a *Pāṭṭūl*-form of the stem בָּחַל, comp. קִדְקִד § 84 b, letter *p*.

- s* 4. To the fourth class, for which no Paradigm is required, belong all the numerous forms which in classical Hebrew have *unchangeable vowels* throughout, the originally short vowel of the first syllable having become vocal *S^wa*, owing to the tone being thrown forward. Of the forms mentioned in §§ 84 and 85 those from ע' stems especially belong to this class, as מְגִלָּה *scroll*, תְּהִלָּה *praise*, תְּפִלָּה *prayer* (§ 85. *i* and *g*), as well as the feminines of the participle *Hiph'il* of verbs ע' ע', e.g. מְאִירָה *enlightening* (from מְאִיר), and generally the feminines of ע' ע' stems which are compounded with the *preformative* כ, as מְנוּחָה *rest* (from מְנוּח), see § 85. *i*; from ל' stems perhaps also תְּעֻלָּה *conduit* (constr. st. תְּעֻלָּת Is. 7, 3 and elsewhere) and תְּלַאֲחָה *travail*. Thus all these forms coincide externally with those which already, as masculines, have unchangeable vowels throughout (see the list of them in § 93. *ww*).

- t* 5. The feminine ending יָת־ (apart from ל' forms like בְּבִית, § 94. *f*) arises from the addition of the feminine ת to the ending יָ, which is employed to form

¹ עֲשֻׁתָּרַת *Astarte* (plur. עֲשֻׁתָּרוֹת), which was formerly included among these examples, is most probably due to an intentional alteration of the original עֲשֻׁתָּרַת, like מִלָּה Lev. 18, 21, &c. (for מִלָּה), with the vowels of בִּשְׁתָּה *shame*, the latter word having been substituted in reading for the name of the goddess.

adjectives, &c., see § 86. *d*, *h*, and *k*. The ending *ית*, mentioned in the same place, is attached, in segholate forms, sometimes to the ground-form, as *עֲשׂוּתָהּ* Job 12, 5, sometimes to forms with a half-closed syllable, as *מִלְכּוּתָהּ*; from *לִי"ה* stems we find forms sometimes like *שְׁבוּתָהּ* *captivity*, sometimes like *בְּכוּתָהּ* *weeping*, *גְּלוּתָהּ* *exile*, *חֲזוֹן* *vision*; the latter retain the *ā* of the first syllable even in the *constr. st.* and before *suffixes*. From a *qāṭil*-form is formed *קְבֻרָתָהּ* *difficulty*; from a *qāṭil*-form *מְקֻרָתָהּ* &c.

In the plural of these forms different methods of treatment may be distinguished. ^u In some cases the whole ending *ית* is retained, as if belonging to the stem (comp. above, letter *f*), e. g. *מְלִכּוּתֵיהֶם* from *מִלְכּוּתָהּ*, in others this ending is resolved, as in *מְלִכּוּתֵיהֶם* Dan. 8, 22 (no doubt for *māḥḥuwwūtāh*), as well as in *עֲדוּתֵיהֶם* 'edh^uwūtāh, from *עֲדוּתָהּ* *testimony*, but only in connexion with *suffixes*, *עֲדוּתֵיהֶם* Ps. 119, 14, &c.; *עֲדוּתֵיהֶם* 1 Ki. 2, 3, &c.

§ 96. Nouns of Peculiar Formation.

In the following Paradigms ¹, pp. 294 to 296, a number of frequently used nouns are arranged, whose flexion presents more or less striking peculiarities. These peculiarities, however, are almost always subordinate to the usual phonetic laws, and the usual designation of the nouns as *irregular* is, therefore, not justified, when once the ground-forms are properly recognized on which the present forms are based.

¹ The only omissions from these Paradigms are *אֶחָד*, *חֵם* and *חֲמוּת* (on which see the remarks), and all the forms which are not found in the Old Testament.

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	אָב	אָח	אָחוּת	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁה
	(father)	(brother)	(sister)	(man)	(woman)
„ <i>construct</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחוּת	אִישׁ	אִשָּׁה
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	אָבִי	אָחִי	אָחִי	אִישִׁי	אִשְׁתִּי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבִיךָ	אָחִיךָ	אָחוּתְךָ		אִשְׁתְּךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>	אָבִיךָ	אָחִיךָ	אָחוּתְךָ	אִישֶׁךָ	
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבִיו (אָבִידוֹ)	אָחִיו (אָחִידוֹ)	אָחוּתוֹ	אִישׁוֹ	אִשְׁתּוֹ
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	אָבִיהָ	אָחִיהָ	אָחוּתָהּ	אִישָׁהּ	
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	אָבֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ	אָחוּתֵנוּ		
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	[אָחוּתְכֶם]		
„ <i>2 fem.</i>	אָבֵיכֶן				
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבֵיהֶם	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוּתָם		
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	אָבֵיהֶן				
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִים		אֲנָשִׁים	נָשִׁים
„ <i>construct</i>	אָבוֹת	אָחִי		אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	אָבוֹתִי	אָחִי, pause	אָחוּתִי	אֲנָשִׁי	נָשִׁי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֶיךָ	אָחֶיךָ		אֲנָשֶׁיךָ	נָשֶׁיךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>		אָחֶיךָ	אָחוּתְךָ		
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתָיו	אָחָיו	אָחוּתָיו	אֲנָשָׁיו	נָשָׁיו
„ <i>3 fem.</i>		אָחֵיהָ		אֲנָשֶׁיהָ	
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	אָבוֹתֵינוּ	אָחֵינוּ		אֲנָשֵׁינוּ	נָשֵׁינוּ
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיכֶם	אָחֵיכֶם	אָחוּתֵיכֶם		נָשֵׁיכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	אָבוֹתֵיהֶם (אָבוֹתֵיהֶם)	אָחֵיהֶם	אָחוּתֵיהֶם	אֲנָשֵׁיהֶם	נָשֵׁיהֶם
„ <i>3 fem.</i>				אֲנָשֵׁיהֶן	

REMARKS.

אָב *father*; the *constr.* אָבִי, like אָחִי and בְּנִי (which occurs once), may perhaps be reckoned among the remains of an earlier linguistic period, discussed in § 90. L. However, אָב also occurs in compound proper names, e.g. אֲבִישָׁלוֹם, beside אֲבִישָׁלוֹן, &c.; also Gen. 17, 4 sq. אֲבִיהֶם for the purpose of explaining the name אֲבִירָהם. On the plur. אָבוֹת see § 87. p.

אָח *brother*. The plur. *absol.* אָחִים has *Dageš forte implicitum* (§ 22. c); אָחִי stands for אָחִי according to the phonetic law stated in § 27. q, and so also אָחִי in *pause* for אָחִי. The sharpening of the ח merely serves to keep the preceding *Pathah* short, as in אָחִים, &c. (§ 93. ee).

אָחִי *one* (for אָחִי, likewise with *Dageš forte implicitum*, § 22. c, comp. § 27. q), *constr.* and otherwise in close connexion, אָחִי (Gen. 48, 22. 2 Sam. 17, 22. Is. 27, 12.

אִמָּה	בֵּית	בֶּן	בַּת	יוֹם	כֵּלִי
(handmaid)	(house)	(son)	(daughter)	(day)	(vessel)
	בֵּית	בֶּן	בַּת	יוֹם	כֵּלִי
אִמָּתִי	בֵּיתִי	בְּנִי	בָּתִּי		
אִמָּתְךָ	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ, pause	בָּתְךָ, pause		כֵּלְיְךָ
	בֵּיתְךָ	בְּנֶךָ			
אִמָּתוֹ	בֵּיתוֹ	בְּנוֹ	בָּתּוֹ	יוֹמוֹ	
אִמָּתָהּ	בֵּיתָהּ	בְּנָהּ	בָּתָּהּ		
		בְּנֹתָהּ			
	בְּיָדְכֶם		בְּיָדְכֶם		
	בְּיָדָם			יוֹמָם	
אִמָּחוֹת	בָּתִּים	בָּנִים	בָּנוֹת	יָמִים	כֵּלִים
אִמָּחוֹת	בָּתִּי	בְּנֵי	בָּנוֹת	יָמֵי	כֵּלֵי
אִמָּהוֹתִי		בְּנֵי	בָּנֹתִי	יָמֵי	כֵּלֵי
	בָּתֶּיךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	בָּנֹתֶיךָ	יָמֶיךָ	כֵּלֶיךָ
	בָּתֶּיךָ	בְּנֶיךָ	בָּנֹתֶיךָ	יָמֶיךָ	כֵּלֶיךָ
אִמָּהוֹתַי		בְּנָיו	בָּנֹתַי	יָמָיו	כֵּלָיו
אִמָּהוֹתֶיהָ		בְּנֵיהָ	בָּנֹתֶיהָ	יָמֶיהָ	כֵּלֶיהָ
	בָּתֵּינוּ	בְּנֵינוּ	בָּנֹתֵינוּ	יָמֵינוּ	כֵּלֵינוּ
אִמָּהוֹתֵיכֶם	בָּתֵּיכֶם	בְּנֵיכֶם	בָּנֹתֵיכֶם	יָמֵיכֶם	כֵּלֵיכֶם
	בָּתֵּיהֶם	בְּנֵיהֶם	בָּנֹתֵיהֶם	יָמֵיהֶם	כֵּלֵיהֶם
אִמָּהוֹתֶיהֶן	בָּתֵּיהֶן	בְּנֵיהֶן			

Zech. 11, 7; and especially before מֶן [מִן] Gen. 3, 22. Ex. 30, 14. Num. 16, 15. Jud. 17, 5. 1 Sam. 9, 3. Ezek. 18, 10; fem. אִמָּה *una* (for אִמָּתְךָ, according to § 19. d'), in pause אִמָּה. Once חָד masc. (by aphaeresis, § 19. h), Ezek. 33, 30, as in Aramaic; plur. אִמָּתֶיךָ *some*, but also *idem*.

אִמָּה *sister*, from *dhāwdt* or *dhādydt*, with elision of the *l* or *y*, and the *dh*, which has arisen from *dh*, obscured to *dh*. In Num. 6, 7 אִמָּתוֹ stands for אִמָּתוֹ (with *Dageš forte implicitum* in the מ). The plur. *absol.* (אִמָּתֹת) does not happen to occur. In Ezek. 16, 52 אִמָּתֹתְךָ occurs (for אִמָּתֶיךָ). In the forms אִמָּתִי Jos. 2, 13 *Keth.*, אִמָּתֶיךָ Ezek. 16, 51. 55. 61 (to be read also in verse 45 for אִמָּתֶיךָ, which has been erroneously assimilated to the singular occurring in vv. 48. 49. 56), and אִמָּתֵיכֶם Hos. 2, 3 (for which, however, read אִמָּתְכֶם) the third radical has been entirely lost.

<i>Sing. absolute</i>	[מַי] (water)	עִיר (city)	פֶּה (mouth)	רֹאשׁ (head)	שֵׁם (name)	[שָׁמַי] (heaven)
„ <i>construct</i>		עִיר	פִּי	רֹאשׁ	שֵׁם	שָׁמַי
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>		עִירִי	פִּי	רֹאשִׁי	שְׁמִי	שָׁמַי
„ <i>2 masc.</i>		עִירְךָ	פִּיךָ	רֹאשְׁךָ	שְׁמֶךָ, pause	שָׁמַיְךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>				רֹאשְׁךָ	שְׁמֶךָ	שָׁמַיְךָ
„ <i>3 masc.</i>		עִירוֹ	פִּיו	רֹאשׁוֹ	שְׁמוֹ	שָׁמַיו
„ <i>3 fem.</i>		עִירָהּ	פִּיהָ	רֹאשָׁהּ	שְׁמָהּ	שָׁמֶיהָ
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>			פִּינוּ	רֹאשֵׁנוּ	שְׁמֵנוּ	שָׁמַיְנוּ
„ <i>2 masc.</i>			פִּיכֶם	רֹאשֵׁיכֶם	שְׁמֵיכֶם	שָׁמַיְכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>		עִירָם	פִּיהֶם	רֹאשֵׁיהֶם	שְׁמֵיהֶם	שָׁמַיֵיהֶם
„ <i>3 fem.</i>			פִּיהֶן	רֹאשֵׁיהֶן		
<i>Plur. absolute</i>	מַיִם	עִירִים	פִּיּוֹת	רֹאשִׁים	שְׁמוֹת	שָׁמַיִם
„ <i>construct</i>	מַיִי, מֵי	עִרֵי		רֹאשֵׁי	שְׁמוֹת	שָׁמַיִם
„ <i>with suff. of 1 sing.</i>	מַיִי	עִרִי				
„ <i>2 masc.</i>	מַיִיךָ	עִרְךָ				שָׁמַיְךָ
„ <i>2 fem.</i>		עִרְךָ				
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	מַיִמוֹ	עִרְיוֹ		רֹאשֵׁיו		שָׁמַיו
„ <i>3 fem.</i>	מַיִמֶיהָ	עִרְיָהּ		רֹאשֶׁיהָ		
„ <i>1 Pl.</i>	מַיִמֵּנוּ	עִרְיָנוּ		רֹאשֵׁינוּ		
„ <i>2 masc.</i>		עִרְיָכֶם		רֹאשֵׁיכֶם		שָׁמַיְכֶם
„ <i>3 masc.</i>	מַיִמֵּיהֶם	עִרְיָהֶם		רֹאשֵׁיהֶם	שְׁמוֹתָם	
„ <i>3 fem.</i>				רֹאשֵׁיהֶן	שְׁמוֹתָן	

אִישׁ *man*, according to the common opinion either incorrectly lengthened for אִישׁ (from 'אִישׁ, with assimilation of the *Nam* of the ground-form 'איִשׁ from the stem אִשַׁ, which again has been attenuated from 'אנִשׁ), or softened directly from 'איִשׁ. It is, however, probable that a separate stem (אִישׁ *to be strong*?) is to be assumed for the singular¹; consequently the stem אִישׁ *to be sociable*, would be connected only with the plur. אִישִׁים (אִישִׁים is found only in Is. 53, 3. Ps. 141, 4. Prov. 8, 4).

אִמָּה *slave, handmaid*; with the plur. אִמָּהוֹת, with consonantal ה, comp. in Aram. אִמָּהוֹת *fathers*, and similarly in Phoen. דִּלְהָת from דִּלְת, also Arab. 'abāhāt

¹ So already Gesenius in his *Thes. linguae Hebr.* i. 83 sq., and recently again Friedr. Delitzsch, *Prolegg.*, p. 160 sqq., Praetorius in Kuhn's *Orient. L. B.*, 1884, p. 196; König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 38; while Nöldeke (*ZDMG.* 1886, p. 739 sqq.), against Delitzsch, would connect both אִישׁ and אִישִׁים with the stem אִישׁ.

(fathers), 'ummaħdt (mothers), with an artificial expansion into a trilateral stem.

אִשָּׁה woman, probably from אִשָּׁה; ? from אִשָּׁה to be weak (= Arabic 'anīf), and therefore distinct from אִשָּׁה to be sociable (see above, on אִשָּׁה). So De Lagarde, *Uebersicht*, p. 68; König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 159 sq. The form אִשָּׁה (for 'āš, with ה fem. from 'āš, after rejection of the doubling and lengthening of the *š* to *z*, comp. חֲמִשָּׁה as constr. st. of חֲמִשָּׁה five) occurs in Deut. 21, 11. 1 Sam. 28, 7. Ps. 58, 9, even in *absol. st.* [cf., however, below, § 130. 4, 5].—In Ps. 128, 3 אִשָּׁה is found for אִשָּׁה. Instead of the plur. נָשִׁים (by aphaeresis from נָשִׁים according to Friedr. Delitzsch, from another distinct stem, נָשָׁה), we find in Ezek. 23, 44 אִשָּׁה¹.

בֵּית house, plur. בָּתִּים (only in Deut. 6, 11. 1 Chron. 28, 11 בָּתִּים without *Metheg*), pronounced *bāttm*. The explanation of the Dageš in the ת is still a matter of dispute. According to Jewish tradition (comp. Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, ed. 3, p. 79), the Dageš forte (after firm *Metheg*; comp. § 16. f. ζ) serves merely to distinguish this word from בָּתִּים passing the night (*part. Qal* of בָּתָּה); the Syriac *bāttm*, however, shows that the Dageš is original, and belongs to the character of the form. According to Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 88, בָּתִּים is simply contracted from *bai-tm* (as אֵן from אֵין, עֵינִים from עֵינִים, &c.), and the Dageš, therefore, is *lene*; König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 56, proposes the name *Dageš forte orthoconsonanticum*; Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix. p. 206, assumes for the plural a stem distinct from that of the singular. The incorrectness of the formerly common pronunciation *bottm* is sufficiently shown by the Babylonian punctuation (see § 8. d, note 2), which leaves no doubt as to the *d*.

בֶּן son (Gen. 30, 19 בְּנֵי-שָׁרָי, constr. usually בְּנֵי (also with a conjunctive accent as an equivalent for *Maggeph*, Gen. 17, 17. Is. 8, 2, and elsewhere, 1 Chron. 9, 21; even with smaller disjunctives, especially in the combination בְּנֵי, Ex. 30, 14. Lev. 27, 3, and elsewhere [בְּנֵי only after אִם and before חֹדֶשׁ, also in Is. 51, 12; see Strack on Ex. 30, 14]), rarely בְּנֵי (Deut. 25, 2. Jon. 4, 10 twice, Prov. 30, 1, and so always in the combination בְּנֵי-נָנִי, and in the proper names בְּנֵי-יִמְיָי [but בְּנֵי-יִמְיָי *Benjamite*] and בְּנֵי-יִקָּה Prov. 30, 1), once בְּנֵי (comp. § 90. f) Gen. 49, 11, and בְּנֵי (§ 90. n) Num. 23, 18. 24, 3. 15.—In Gen. 49, 22 בְּנֵי, for which בְּנֵי ought to be read, is intended by the Masora for the *absol. st.*, not the *constr.*

בַּת daughter (from *bant*, and this again, according to the law stated in § 69. c, for *bint*, fem. of בֶּן), with suff. בָּתִּי for בְּנָתִי. Plur. בָּנוֹת from the sing. בָּנָה, comp. בָּנִים sons.

חָם husband's father, only with suff. חָמִי, חָמִיָּה; and חֲמוֹת husband's mother, only with suff. חֲמוֹתִי, חֲמוֹתָהּ. Comp. אָב, אִמָּה and אֲחִי, אֲחֻתָּהּ.

יּוֹם day (Arab. *yaum*), dual יּוֹמִים; the plur. יָמִים is probably from a different sing. (יָם *yām*)², constr. יָמִי and (poetically) יָמוֹת, Deut. 32, 7. Ps. 90, 15.

¹ Friedr. Delitzsch (in the Babylonian glosses to Baer's text of Ezekiel, p. xi) on Ezek. 23, 44, remarks that the Assyro-Babylonian forms from *alīatu* (woman), the plur. *alīātī* corresponding, therefore, to אִשָּׁה, not to the ordinary plur. נָשִׁים.

² The supposition (put forward also in earlier editions of this Grammar) that the plur. יָמִים arose from יּוֹמִים through elision of the *י*, is invalidated by the fact

כֶּלִי vessel, in pause **כֶּלִי** (with suff. **כֶּלָיִךְ** Deut. 23, 25) from **כָּלָה** to contain, plur. **כֶּלִים** (as if from **כָּלָה**, **כֶּלָה**; according to König, ii. 63, simply shortened from *kilytm*).

מַיִם water; comp. on the plur. § 88. d.

עִיר city. The plur. **עָרִים** is scarcely syncopated from **עָרִים**, as it is pointed in Jud. 10, 4 (no doubt erroneously, in imitation of the preceding **עָרִים** *ass colls*), but from a kindred sing. **עָר**, which still occurs in proper names.

פֶּה mouth, constr. st. **פִּי** (for original **פִּי** = **פֶּה**?). Its origin is still disputed. According to Gesenius and König (ii. 103), **פֶּה** stands for **פָּאָה** (ground-form *pi'ay*) from **פָּאָה** to breathe, to blow; according to Olshausen, for **פִּי**, from a stem **פָּה** or **פֶּה**. But parallel with the Hebrew **פֶּה** are Assy. *pā*, Arab. *fā*, *fam*, *famm*, *fumm*, Bibl. Aram. **פִּי**, **פִּמָּא**, Syr. *pām*, *pāmā*, so that Barth, ZDMG. xli. p. 634, assumes two forms of development from the same stem (**פָּה**), viz. *fm* and *fw*. **פִּי** my mouth, from *pi-y*; for **פִּיהֶם** we find in Ps. 17, 10. 58, 7. 59, 13 **פִּימוֹ**. The supposed plur. **פִּיִּם** 1 Sam. 13, 21 is generally explained as a contraction from **פִּיִּם**, but the text is altogether corrupt. The plur. **פִּיּוֹת**, for the edges of a sword, occurs in Prov. 5, 4; reduplicated **פִּיּוֹתָיו** Is. 41, 15. Ps. 149, 6.

רֹאשׁ head (obscured from **רֹאשׁ** = *raš*); plur. **רִאשִׁים** (for **רִאשִׁים**, § 23. c); **רִאשֵׁיוֹ** only in Is. 15, 2.

רֶשֶׁת a head of small cattle (sheep or goat), constr. st. **רֶשֶׁת**, with suff. **רֶשֶׁתִּי** 1 Sam. 14, 34 and **רֶשֶׁתִּי** Deut. 22, 1, according to König, ii. 131, from a ground-form *si'ay*, but according to De Lagarde, Uebersicht, 81 sq., from a stem **רָשׁ** (**רָשׁ** = *say* = *wisay*).

שֵׁם name, constr. generally **שֵׁם** (only six times **שֵׁם**); comp. **שֵׁם**.

שָׁמַיִם heaven (§ 88. d).

§ 97. Numerals. (a) Cardinal Numbers.

- a 1. The cardinal numbers from 2 to 10, in Hebrew, are substantives with an abstract meaning, like *trias*, *decas*, *nevrás*, and were, therefore, originally attached in the construct st. to the word numbered, e.g. **שְׁלֹשָׁת בָּנִים** *trias filiorum*. However, the appositional construction of the numerals was likewise in use, side by side with this, at an early date, e.g. **שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים**, *trias*, sc. *fili*, and from the latter was developed the use of the abstract numerals as adjectives (placed after their noun), see § 134. c **אֶחָד** *unus*, fem. **אֶחָדָה** *una*, see § 96, show even

that the *a* becomes vocal *šwā* in the constr. st. The view that **אֶחָד** is merely an incorrect obscuring of **אֶחָד**, and therefore distinct from the Arab. *yawm*, is contradicted by the invariable spelling **אֶחָד**, &c., notwithstanding the spelling **אֶחָדִים** (= **אֶחָדִים**) in the Siloam inscription, line 3 (cf. § 7. f), and **אֶחָדִים** Hos. 6, 2. Cf. also the note on § 100. g.

by their form that they are adjectives, although even in this case combinations like *אֶחָד הַהָרִים* *unus e montibus* are possible). The consequence of the appositional, and finally adjectival, construction was, that for numerals connected with feminine nouns a special (and, with the exception of *שְׁתֵּי*, a shorter) form came to be used, whilst the original forms, with the abstract feminine ending, were used in connexion with masculine nouns. Hence, with the numerals from 3 to 10, it comes to appear as if the masculine form of the numeral were connected with the feminine substantive, and the feminine with the masculine substantive. For the expression of duality, dual forms are naturally used, with the usual distinction of gender. Accordingly, the numerals from 1 to 10 are as follows:

	<i>With the Masculine.</i>		<i>With the Feminine.</i>		
	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>	<i>Absol.</i>	<i>Constr.</i>	
1.	אֶחָד	אֶחָד	אֶחָת	אֶחָת	
2.	שְׁנַיִם	שְׁנֵי	שְׁתֵּי ¹	שְׁתֵּי	
3.	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשָׁה	שְׁלֹשׁ	שְׁלֹשׁ	
4.	אַרְבָּעָה	אַרְבַּעַת	אַרְבַּע	אַרְבַּע	
5.	חֲמִשָּׁה	חֲמִשָּׁה	חֲמִשׁ	חֲמִשׁ	
6.	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשֶׁת	שֵׁשׁ	שֵׁשׁ	
7.	שִׁבְעָה	שִׁבְעַת	שִׁבַּע	שִׁבַּע	
8.	שְׁמוֹנָה	שְׁמוֹנַת	שְׁמוֹנָה	שְׁמוֹנָה	
9.	תִּשְׁעָה	תִּשְׁעַת	תִּשְׁעָה	תִּשְׁעָה	
10.	עֶשְׂרֵה	עֶשְׂרֵת	עֶשְׂרֵה	עֶשְׂרֵה	

¹ Shortened from *שְׁתַּיִם*, which would be the regular feminine form of *שְׁנַיִם*. Nevertheless, the *Dageš* in *שְׁתַּיִם*, &c. (even after *מן*; *מִשְׁתַּיִם* Jon. 4, 11; comp., however, *מִשְׁתֵּי* Jud. 16, 28) can by no means be regarded as a *Dageš forte* arising from assimilation of the *Nān*, for in that case the word could only be *שְׁתַּיִם* (comp. Arab. *ṣināni*). It is rather to be read *ṣṭayim*, *ṣṭ* (with *Dageš lene*), comp. *אֶשְׁתַּיִם*, representing the later Palestinian pronunciation (Philippi, *ZDMG.* xlix. p. 206), and Arab. *ʿiṣṭāni* (with a kind of prosthetic *ṣ*; comp. § 19. m), as a further feminine form of *ʿiṣṭāni*, *duo*.—Philippi gives a very thorough treatment of the subject in his article, 'Das Zahlwort Zwei im semitischen' (*ZDMG.* xxxii. p. 21 sqq.), according to which the original form was *ṭiny*, which, however, even in the primitive language, was shortened to *ṭin*. In his opinion, *שְׁנַיִם* goes back to the dual form *ṭinaimā*, *שְׁתַּיִם* to *ṭinatalimā*, *ṭinatalimā*, so that in that case *שְׁתַּיִם*, which in the Babylonian Codex of 916 has been almost always substituted by a later hand for *שְׁתַּיִם*, would be the more original and correct form.

On the connective forms *שבע, השבע*, comp. the analogous forms in § 93. *h.*

- c* The other Semitic languages also exhibit the same peculiarity in the external differentiation of the numerals from 3 to 10 as regards gender. The full form of the numeral abstracts is only rarely found in connexion with feminine nouns¹, e. g. *שלושת הנשים* Gen. 7, 13. 1 Sam. 10, 3. Job 1, 4. Ezek. 7, 2 *K'tibh.*; probably also Jos. 17, 11, where we should read with Dillmann *שבע הנפשות*. In apposition, Zech. 3, 9. 4, 2, comp. Jer. 36, 23. Conversely in Gen. 38, 24 *שלוש חדרים* (but in the Samaritan *שלושת*).—For *שבעה* *seven*, there occurs in Job 42, 13 the strange form *שבענה*, according to Ewald an old feminine substantive (comp. the German *ein Siebend*, a set of seven), but more probably a scribal error.

- d* 2. The numerals from 11 to 19 are formed by placing the units, without the *copula*, before the number ten (in the form *עשר* masc., *עשרה* fem.), but without the two words being joined into one. However, owing to their rapid pronunciation in one breath, the units almost invariably appear in the form of the *construct st.* (without pretonic vowels); comp., in the following table, *אחד* and *אחת* in the numeral 11, and the units in the feminine numerals from 13 upwards. The proper connective forms, however, of the masculine abstracts, like *שלוש*, &c., are not admitted in combination with *עשר*, since the units are merely in apposition, and not in a genitive relation. Also *שני* and *שתי*, in the number 12, are only apparently in the *construct st.*, although formed in the same way (by contraction of the *ay*, and the loss through phonetic decay of the *ד* of *שנים, שתים*), and for the same reason, viz. their close connexion with the following noun. In *שנים* and *שתים* the language has contented itself with the contraction of the *ay* (without rejecting the *ד*), unless both forms are to be regarded as the Masoretic *Q're perpetuum* (§ 17), viz. *שני, שתי*, for *שנים, שתים*, as really intended by the *K'tibh.*

- e* Accordingly the numbers from 11 upwards are—

	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
11.	<i>אחד עשר</i> <i>עשרה</i>	<i>אחת עשרה</i> <i>עשרתי עשרה</i>

¹ In the vulgar dialects of Arabic, and in Ethiopic, the feminine form of the numeral is by far the more common. This form appears also in Hebrew, when the number is regarded in the abstract, as in the multiplicatives (see § 97. *h.*).

² *עשרתי*, which remained for a long time unexplained, was recognized (first by J. Oppert) in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions in the form *istin* or *istén*; comp. Friedr. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 203. and P. Haupt, in the *American Journal of Philology*, viii. 269. Accordingly, *עשרתי עשר* is a compound, like the

	Masculine.	Feminine.
12.	שְׁנַיִם עָשָׂר	שְׁתַּיִם עָשָׂרָה
	שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר	שְׁתֵּי עָשָׂרָה
13.	שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר	שְׁלֹשׁ עָשָׂרָה

&c., on the analogy of the last. These numerals regularly have only the above form. In regard to their syntax, comp. § 134. f.

Very rarely the units appear in the masc. in the *constr. st.*, as חֲמִשָּׁת עָשָׂר *fifteen*, Jud. 8, 10. 2 Sam. 19, 18; שְׁמֹנֶת עָשָׂר *eighteen*, Jud. 20, 25.

3. The tens from 30 to 90 are expressed by the plural forms *f* of the units (so that the plural here always stands for *ten times* the unit, thus, שְׁלֹשִׁים 30, אַרְבָּעִים 40, חֲמִשִּׁים 50, שִׁשִּׁים 60, שִׁבְעִים 70, שְׁמֹנִים 80, תֵּשְׁעִים 90. But *twenty* is expressed by עָשָׂרִים, plur. of עָשָׂר *ten*¹. These numerals are all of common gender, and do not admit of the *construct state*.—In compound numerals, like 22, 23, 44, &c., the units may precede (*two and twenty*, as in Arabic and English), e. g. Num. 3, 39. 26, 14. Very frequently, however, the reverse order is found (*twenty and two*, as in Syriac, cf. French and English *twenty-two*), e. g. 1 Chron. 12, 28. 18, 5². In all cases the units and tens are connected by the *copula*, ordinarily ׀, but ׀ before numerals with the tone on the penultima, ׀ before —, ׀ before שְׁדָּה; see § 104. d, e, g.

The remaining numerals are the substantives—

100 מֵאָה fem., *constr.* מֵאָה.

200 מֵאָהִים dual (contracted from מֵאָהִים; comp. § 23. c).

Sansk. *ekādaśan*, *ἑκαδεκα*, *undecim* (analogous to the combination of units and tens in the numerals from 12–19), and is used at the same time in the composition of the feminine numeral eleven. On the gradual substitution of עָשָׂרִים for עָשָׂר and אָחָד see Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 226; עָשָׂרִים occurs only in the Priestly Code, in Jer., Ezek., in the prologue to Deuteronomy (i. 3), and in passages undoubtedly post-exilic, so that it may very well be a loan-word from the Babylonian.

¹ For the irregular plural forms עָשָׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, תֵּשְׁעִים (from the *segholates* עָשָׂר, שִׁבְעָה, תֵּשַׁע), we should expect עָשָׂרִים, שִׁבְעִים, תֵּשְׁעִים. Is this very unusual deviation from the common formation (see above, § 93. l, o, r) connected with the special meaning of these plurals?

² According to the conclusions of König (*De Criticæ Sacrae Argumento*, p. 61, and *Lehrgeb.* ii. p. 215 sqq.), the smaller number more commonly precedes in Ezek. and the Priestly Code, but the larger always elsewhere. S. Herner (*Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893, p. 71 sqq.) arrives at the same conclusion by a full examination of the statistics; cf. also his remarks on König in *ZAW.* 1896, i.

- 300 שלש מאות plur. (but in 2 Ki. 11, 4. 9. 10. 15, *K'lh.* המאות).
 1000 אלף masc.
 2000 אלפים dual.
 3000 שלשת אלפים plur., and so on (except עשרה אלפים in 2 Sam. 18, 3. 2 Ki. 24, 14 *K'lh.*; elsewhere always עשרת אלפים).
 10000 רבבה, in the later Books רבות, רבו, רבוא (properly *multitude*, comp. *μυριάς*).
 20000 רבתיים dual (see below, letter *h*); but שתי רבות Neh. 7, 70 (also שתי רבוא Neh. 7, 71).
 40000 ארבע רבוא Neh. 7, 66.
 60000 שש-רבאות Ezra 2, 69 (Baer and Ginsburg רבאות, as in Dan. 11, 12). אלפי רבבה *thousands of myriads*, Gen. 24, 60.

- h* Rem. 1. The dual form which occurs in some of the units has the meaning of our ending *-fold*, e.g. ארבעתיים *fourfold*, 2 Sam. 12, 6; שבעתיים *sevenfold*, Gen. 4, 15. 24. Is. 30, 26. Ps. 12, 7. 79, 12 (comp. § 134. *r*). The dual רבתיים Ps. 68, 18 (explained by שני אלפי *thousands of duplication*) is not meant to be taken in the sense of *two myriads* or *twice the number of myriads*, but in a multiplicative sense.—Besides the plural, which denotes the tens, there are also the plurals אחדים *some*, also *idem*, and עשרות *decades* (not *decem*) Ex. 18, 21. 25.
- i* 2. The *suffixes* to numerals are, as with other nouns, properly *genitives*, although they are translated in English as *nominatives*, e.g. שלשתכם *your triad*, i.e. *you three*, Num. 12, 4.

§ 98. Numerals. (*b*) Ordinal Numbers.

- a* The ordinal numbers from 2 to 10 are formed from the corresponding cardinals by adding the termination ך (§ 86. *h*), before which another ך also is generally inserted between the second and third stem radicals. They are as follows: שני *second*, רביעי, רביעי (like רבע, רבע, without the prosthetic מ, which appears in ארבע, &c.), חמישי or חמישי (which, according to Strack, is always to be read for חמישי), ששי, שביעי, שמיני, תשיעי, עשירי. This *f* in the penultima unquestionably results from the tendency to assimilation with the *f* of the ultima, König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 225. The ordinal *first* is expressed by ראשון (cf. § 27. *x*), from ראש *head, beginning*, with the termination ך (§ 86. *f*). On the use of אחר as an ordinal in numbering the days of the month, comp. § 134. *p*; in such cases as Gen. 1, 5. 2, 11, the meaning of *first* is derived solely from the context.

The feminine forms have the termination יָהּ, more rarely (and *δ* only in the case of 3 and 10) יָהּ. They are employed also to express fractions, e.g. חֲמִישִׁית *fifth* or *fifth part*, עֲשִׂירִית and עֲשִׂירִיָּה *tenth part*. Side by side with these, in the same sense, there are also forms like שְׁלִישׁ *a third*, רִבֵּעַ and רִבְעָה *a quarter*, חֲמִשָּׁה *a fifth part*, and with the affirmative וְעֶשְׂרִין (plur. עֶשְׂרִינִים) *a tenth part*; these are to be regarded as abstracts, and are denominatives from the cardinal numbers. Comp. finally שָׁבֻעַ ἑβδομάς, *a week*; עֶשְׂרִין *a decade* (of days), and also the *tenth day*.

On the expression of the other relations of number, for which the Hebrew has no special forms, see the Syntax, § 134. *q* and *r*.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PARTICLES.

§ 99. General View.

- a* 1. The particles, which in general express the secondary modifications of thought in speech, the closer relation of words to one another, and the mutual connexion of sentences, are for the most part either borrowed or derived from noun-forms, sometimes also from pronouns and verbs (§ 30. *s*). **Primitive* particles (apart from a few demonstrative forms, see § 100. *i*) can only be so called in the sense defined in § 81 sq.
- b* 2. So far as the origin of the particles can be discovered with certainty, they are either (1) borrowed from other parts of speech; i.e. certain forms of the noun, pronoun or verb, with more or less loss of their original meaning, have come to be employed as particles; comp. in the Indo-Germanic languages, e.g. the Latin *certo*, *falso*, *partim*, *verum*, *causa*, the German *statt*, *anstatt*, *wegen*, *weg*, and the English *instead*, *away*; or (2) derived from other parts of speech, either (*a*) by the addition of formative syllables, as ἡμέρη *by day*, from ἡμέρα (comp., however, § 100. *g*); or most commonly (b) by abbreviations effected in various ways, the extent of their mutilation being in proportion to the frequency of their use, so that in some cases (see below) the original stem has become wholly unrecognizable.

Comp. in German *gen*, from *gegen*, *Gegend*; *seit*, from *Seite*; *weil* (originally a particle of time, like our *while*), from *Weile*.

Still more violent abbreviations occur in Greek, Latin, and the Romance languages, e.g. *ἀπό*, *ab*, *a*; *ἐξ*, *ex*, *e*; *ad*, Fr. *à*; *aut*, Fr. *ou*, Ital. *o*; *super*, Ital. *su*¹.

¹ Even short phrases are contracted into one word: Lat. *forsitan*, from *fors sit an*, *δηλονότι*, *δηλαδή*, Fr. *peut-être*, Eng. *prithes* from *I pray thee*.—In Chinese most of the particles are verbs or nouns; e.g. *iù* (to give), and also the sign of the dative; *ì* (to make use of), hence *to*, *for*; *nèi* (the interior), hence *in*.

The greatest shortening occurs in those particles which have *c* entirely lost the character of an independent word, by being reduced to a single consonant with its vowel (generally short) or *š'wd.* According to the laws of syllable formation in Hebrew (§ 26. *m*), such particles cannot stand independently, but are united, as prefixes, with the following word (§ 102), very much like the preformatives of the imperfect (§ 47. *a-d*).

The view that this shortening of whole words to single letters has actually taken *d* place in the gradual course of linguistic development, is rendered highly probable by the fact that similar abbreviations in later Hebrew and Aramaic, i. e. as the development of the original Semitic speech progresses, become more and more striking and frequent. Thus the Biblical Aramaic *וַי* becomes at a later period *ו*; in modern Arabic, e.g. *hallaq* (now) is from *halwaqt*; *lā* (why?) from *li-ayyi-laiin*, &c. Comp. also the analogous cases mentioned above from the Western languages. Nevertheless, the use of the simplest particles belongs already to the earliest periods of the Hebrew language, or, at any rate, to the earliest documents which have come down to us.

3. Less frequently particles are formed by composition; as *מִדָּעַ* *e* *wherefore?* for *מִדָּעַ יָדָעַ* *quid edoctus?* (ῥι μαθών;) or *quid cognitum?* *בְּלִעְדֵּי* (from *בָּל* and *עָדֵי*) *besides*; *מִלְּמַעְלָה* (from *מִן*, *לְ*, *מִלְּמַעְלָה*) *from above, above*.

More frequent is the combination of two words into one without contraction.
e. g. *קִרְעַלְכֶּן*, *אֶחָדְכֶּן*, *אֶחָדְכִּי*, *אֶחָדְכֶּם*.

§ 100. Adverbs.

1. The negative *לֹא* *not*, and a few particles of place and time, *a* as *שָׁם* *there*, are of obscure origin.

2. Forms of other parts of speech, which are used adverbially *b* without further change, are—

(a) Substantives with prepositions, e. g. *בְּמֶאֱדָר* (with *might*) *very*; *לְבַד* *alone* (prop. *in separation*, Fr. *à part*), with suffix *לְבַדִּי* *I alone*; *מִבְּתֵר* *from within, within*; cf. also *בְּאַחַד* (as one) *together*.

(b) Substantives in the accusative (the adverbial case of the Semites, c § 118. *m*), comp. *עַד* ἀρχήν, ὁμαρῶν, e. g. *מֶאֱדָר* (might) *very*, *אֵין* (cessation) *no more*, *הַיּוֹם* (the day) *to-day* (comp. § 126. *b*), *יַחַד* (union) *together*. Several of these continued to be used, though rarely, as substantives, e. g. *סָבִיב*, plur. *סְבִיבִים* and *סְבִיבוֹת*, *circuit*, as adverb *circum, around*; others have quite ceased to be so used, e. g. *בְּכָר* (length) *long ago*; *עוֹד* (repetition, duration) *again or further, longer*.

- d* (c) Adjectives, especially in the feminine (corresponding to the Indo-Germanic neuter), e.g. רִאשׁוֹנָה *primum, formerly* (more frequently בְּרִאשׁוֹנָה, also לְרִאשׁוֹנָה); רַבָּה and רַבַּת *multum, much, enough*; נִפְלְאוֹת *wonderfully* (properly *mirabilibus*, sc. *modis*), יְהוּדִית *Jewish*, i.e. in the Jewish language.
- e* (d) Verbs in the infinitive absolute, especially in *Hiph'il*, which are likewise to be regarded as accusatives (§ 113. *h*), e.g. הִרְבֵּה (prop. *a multiplying*) *much*, לְהִרְבֵּה *in multitude*; הִשָּׁעַם (*mane faciendo*) *early*; הִעָרַב (*vespere faciendo*) *in the evening*.
- f* (e) Pronouns and numerals, e.g. זֶה (prop. *there=at this place*) *here*, הֵנָּה *here, hither* (also of time, comp. עַתָּה and עַדְהֵנָּה = עַדְהֵנָּה *here till now*); אַחַת, שְׁתַּיִם, שֶׁשֶׁ, שִׁבְעָה, אַחַד *once, twice, seven times, a hundred times*; לְשֵׁנִי *for the second time*.
- g* 8. Some adverbs are formed by the addition of formative syllables (most frequently ם) to substantives or adjectives, e.g. אֱמִנָם and אֱמִנָם *truly* (from אֱמִן *truth*); הֵנָּה (by favour) *gratis* (from חַן *gratia*); רִיקָם *in vain, frustra*, but also *empty*, Ruth 1, 21, parallel with the fem. רִיקָה *full* (from רִיק *empty, emptiness, vacuum*); יוֹמָם *by day* (from יוֹם)¹. Comp. also דוֹמָם (an adj. in Hab. 2, 19. Lam. 3, 26; an adv. in Is. 47, 5), and, with *š* in the last syllable, פִּתְאֹם, for פִּתְעֹם, *in a twinkling, suddenly* (from פָּתַע *a twinkling*), and שֶׁלֹּשׁ *the day before yesterday* (from שֶׁלֹּשׁ *three*), the *š* in both cases being probably obscured from an original *š*.—Moreover, comp. אֶחָדָה *backward*, and קִרְבָּה *sordidate*, Mal. 3, 14. In both these cases, the formative syllable *an* has been first attached to the stem, and then the feminine ending *sh*, which is elsewhere used to form adverbs, has been added to it.
- h* The termination ם occurs also in the formation of substantives, e.g. סֻלָּם *ladder* (from סָלַל), and hence the above adverbs may equally well be regarded as nouns used adverbially, so that דוֹמָם, יוֹמָם, would correspond to יוֹם, יוֹם (§ 85, Nos. 53, 54), comp. פְּדוּיוֹם, equivalent to פְּדוּיוֹן *redemption*, פְּדוּתָם (with prep.)

¹ Is this דוֹמָם an instance of the locative or temporal termination (cf. especially צִוְרוֹם) mentioned in § 88. c f, Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. p. 721, considers יוֹמָם a secondary substantival form (used adverbially like לַיְלָה *noctu*), corresponding to the Phœnician and Aramaic יִמָּם, Syr. *'imāmā*; cf., on the other hand, König, ii. 255: the Phœn. יִמָּם is probably plural, and in the case of the parallel Syriac *'imāmā*. the derived form (occurring in יוֹמָם) is also used to express *day*, beside the ordinary *ḡm*.—De Lagarde's opinion (*Novae psalt. gr. editionis specimen*, p. 12 sq.) that יוֹמָם should be read יָמָם is altogether improbable.

suddenly, 2 Chron. 29, 36. According to others, this *am* is an obsolete accusative ending, to be compared with the indeterminate accusative sing. in *ām* in Arabic.

4. A number of forms standing in very close relation to the *i* demonstrative pronoun may be regarded as primitive adverbs, since they arise directly from a combination of demonstrative sounds. Some of these have subsequently suffered great mutilation, the extent of which, however, can now very rarely be ascertained with certainty. Such are e.g. *אז* then, *כן*, *כֵּן* thus (cf. *אֵיכָּה*, *אֵיכָּה* how?), *אז* only, *אז* truly (on all these adverbs, see the Lexicon), and especially the interrogative *ה* (*Hē interrogativum*), e.g. *הֲלֵא* (Deut. 3, 11 *הֲלֵא*) *nonne?* *הֲנִים* *num etiam?* This *Hē interrogativum* is perhaps shortened from *הָלֵא*, which is still used in Arabic, and, according to the view of a certain school of Masoretes, occurs also in Hebrew in Deut. 32, 6¹.

The *ה* interrogative takes—(1) *Hateph-Pathah* generally before non-gutturals *k* (even before *ר*), with a firm vowel, e.g. *הֲלֵא* hast thou set? see the interrogative clause, § 150. *c* (*הֲיִיטֵב* Lev. 10, 19 is an exception).

(2) Before a consonant with *S^{wa}*, usually *Pathah* without a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִירָה* Gen. 27, 38, comp. 18, 17. 29, 5. 30, 15. 34, 31; less frequently (in about ten passages), *Pathah* with a following *Dageš forte*, e.g. *הֲבִירָה* *num in via*, Ezek. 20, 30, *הֲלֵכָה* Gen. 17, 17. 18, 21. 37, 32. Num. 13, 19. Job 23, 6; even in *ר*, 1 Sam. 10, 24. 17, 25. 2 Ki. 6, 32.

(3) Before gutturals, not pointed with either *Qames* or *Hateph-Qames*, it takes *Pathah*, e.g. *הֲאֵלֵךְ* shall I go? *הֲאַתָּה* *num tu?* *הֲאִם* *num si*; *הֲאֵרָצָה* Mal. 1, 13; also in Jud. 6, 31 read *הֲאַתָּם* (not *הֵא*), likewise *ה* in Jud. 12, 5. Jer. 8, 19. Neh. 6, 11.—In *הֲאִישׁ* Num. 16, 22, the Masora intends the article; we should read *הָאִישׁ*, and comp. Deut. 20, 19; in Eccl. 3, 21 read *הָעֵלֶה* and *הֲיִרְדָּה*; the article is a correction due to doctrinal motives.

(4) The *ה* takes *S^{ghl}* before gutturals which have *Qames* or (as in Jud. 9, 9 sqq.) *Hateph-Qames*, e.g. *הֲאִמְצִי* Mic. 2, 7; *הֲאִנֹכִי* Job 21, 4; *הֲהִיחָה* Joel 1, 2; *הֲהִיטֵב* Gen. 24, 5 (comp. the analogous instances in § 22. *c*, § 35. *h*, § 63. *h*). The place of this interrogative particle is always at the beginning of the clause.

5. Some adverbs occur also in connexion with suffixes, thus *יָשָׁךְ* thou art there, 3rd sing. masc. *יָשָׁנָה*, and plur. masc. *יָשָׁנִים*; *אֵינִי* I am not, 2nd sing. *אֵינְךָ*, fem. *אֵינִי*, 3rd sing. *אֵינָהּ*, fem. *אֵינֶיהָ*, 2nd plur. *אֵינְכֶם*, 3rd plur. masc. *אֵינָם*.—Also *עוֹדֵנִי* I am yet (*עוֹדֵי* only in *עוֹדֵי* and *מְעוֹדֵי*), *עוֹדֶךָ*, *עוֹדֶיהָ*, *עוֹדֵינִי* (Lam. 4, 17 *K^{sh}*; *עוֹדֵינָהּ* *Q^{re}*), *עוֹדֶם*.—

¹ The separation of the *ה* at the beginning of Deut. 32, 6, expressly noticed by Qimhi (ed. Rittenb., p. 40 b) as an unique instance, is perhaps a protest against admitting a particle *הָלֵא*.

אֵיךְ *where art thou?* **אֵי** *where is he?* **אֵימָם** *where are they?* The same applies to **הֵן** (**הֵן**) and **הִנֵּה** *behold!* (prop. *here, here is*; see § 105. b), only in Gen. 19, 2 **הִנֵּה נָא**; with suffixes, **הִנֵּנִי** and **הִנֵּנִי** (Gen. 22, 7 with *Munah*), in pause **הִנֵּנִי** *behold me (here am I)*, **הִנֵּךְ** (pause **הִנֵּךְ** Ps. 139, 8), **הִנֵּנוּ**, **הִנֵּנָם**, and **הִנֵּהוּ** (*behold us*), and **הִנֵּנִי**, in pause **הִנֵּנִי**, **הִנֵּנָם**, **הִנֵּהוּ**.

p The usual explanation of these suffixes (especially of the forms with *Nān* *epentheticum*) as verbal suffixes, which ascribes some power of verbal government even to forms originally substantival (e.g. **יֵשֶׁנּוּ** *there is, he is*), is at least inadmissible for forms (like **אֵי**, **אֵימָם**, **הִנֵּנִי**) evidently connected with noun-suffixes; even for the other forms it is questionable.

§ 101. Prepositions.

a 1. All words, which by usage serve as prepositions, were originally substantives, viz.:

(a) Substantives in the accusative and in the construct state, so that the noun governed by them is to be considered as in the genitive, and in Arabic actually has the genitive ending, comp. in German *statt dessen, kraft dessen*, in Greek *τούτου χάριν*, in Latin *huius rei causa*, or *gratia, montis instar*¹. Comp. **אַחֵר** (*hinder part**) *behind, after* (*Mil'el* in **בֵּין** **אַחֵר** Lev. 14, 36. Deut. 21, 13. 1 Sam. 10, 5; **אַחֵר** 2 Chron. 32, 9); **אַחֵר** (*side**) *close by*; **בֵּין** (*intermediate space**) *between*; **בְּעֵד**, **בְּעֵד** (*distance*) *behind, around*; **וְיָלָח**, or with *Hireq compaginis* **וְיָלָח** (*removal, want*) *except*; **עַל** (*purpose*) *on account of*; **עַל** (*only* in Deut. 1, 1) *before, over against*; **פָּנֵי** (*separation*; cf. § 119. v) *from, out of*; **בְּפָנֵי** (*coming in front, that which is over against*) *before, over against*; **עַד** (*progress, duration**) *during, until*; **עַל** (*height, upper part**) *upon, over*; **עִם** (*connexion?*) *with*; it is doubtful whether this is to be derived from the same stem as **עִמָּת**, **עִמָּת** *near, beside, like*; **תַּחַת** (*under part**) *under, instead of*.

b (b) Substantives in the construct state, but to be regarded as in the genitive, since they depend on prepositions (especially the inseparable), e.g. **לְפָנֵי** (*in the face of**) *before*; **בְּפִי**, **לְפִי** (*according to the mouth*, i.e. the command of*) *according to*; **בְּגִלָּל** (*in the concern of*) *on account of*; **לְמַעַן** (*for the purpose of*) *on account of*.

c 2. Substantives used adverbially very frequently become preposi-

¹ In the examples which follow, the meaning of the noun is added in parentheses, and, when it is actually in use, is marked with an asterisk.—On a similar use in other languages, see W. von Humboldt, *Über die Kawisprache*, iii. p. 621.

tions in this way, e.g. בְּלֵיל, בְּבֵלִי, מִבְּלֵי, בְּלֵיל, בְּלֵיל, בְּלֵיל (with cessation) *without*, בְּעוֹד (in the duration of) *during*; כְּפִי, כְּפִי (according to the requirement of) *for, according to*.

§ 102. Prefixed Prepositions.

1. Of the words mentioned in § 101, מִן *from, out of*, frequently *a* occurs as a prefix (§ 99. c), and even with its *Nûn* assimilated to the following consonant (by means of *Dageš forte*), e.g. מִן־עֵץ *out of a forest*.

Rem. The separate מִן (always with a following *Maqqeph*) is usual (but not *b* necessary, comp. Jud. 20, 14 with verse 15. Ezek. 43, 6, &c.) only before the article, e.g. מִן־הָעֵץ, and sometimes occurs before the softer consonants, e.g. מִן־אֵן Jer. 44, 18, מִן־בְּנֵי Joel 1, 12. 1 Chron. 5, 18; cf. Ex. 18, 14. Lev. 1, 14. 14, 30. Jud. 7, 23. 10, 4. 19, 16. Ps. 104, 7 (2 Ki. 23, 36 before *ר*; also before *p* in Ps. 18, 49), and elsewhere in the later Books (as in Aramaic)¹; there is besides a poetic by-form מִנִּי (comp. § 90. m) and מִנִּי Is. 30, 11. Its form is most commonly מִן with a following *Dageš*, which may, however, be omitted in letters which have *Šwā* (comp. § 20. m). With a following *י* the מ is, as a rule, contracted to מִי, e.g. מִיָּדִי = מִיָּדִי or מִיָּדִי (but comp. מִיָּשֵׁנִי Dan. 12, 2; מִיָּשֵׁנִי 2 Chron. 20, 11); before gutturals it becomes מִן (according to § 22, c), e.g. מִן־אֵד, מִן־עֵד, מִן־עֵד; מ occurs before ה with the guttural virtually sharpened in מִן־חָוָה *on the outside*, and in מִן־חָוָה Gen. 14, 23; before ה in מִן־חָוָה (comp. § 28. b and § 63. q). The closed syllable here is inconsistent with the supposed virtual sharpening of the ה; probably מִן־חָוָה is merely due to the analogy of מִן־חָוָה; similarly Is. 14, 3 before *ר*; but in 1 Sam. 23, 28. 2 Sam. 18, 16 מִן־דָּוִד is to be read, according to § 22. s.

2. There are also three other particles, the most commonly used *c* prepositions and the particle of comparison, which have been reduced by abbreviation (§ 99. c) to a single prefixed consonant with *Šwā* (but see below), viz.:

אֵל in, at, with.

כִּי towards, to, for, Lat. *ad*.

כִּי like, as, according to (no doubt the remnant of a substantive with the meaning of *matter, kind, instar*).

With regard to the pointing it is to be observed that—

(a) The *Šwā mobile*, with which the above prefixes are usually pronounced, *d* has resulted from the weakening of a short vowel (an original *ā*, according to

¹ König, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, p. 393 (cf. also the almost exhaustive statistics in his *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 292 sqq.), enumerates eight instances of מִן before a word without the article in 2 Samuel and Kings, and forty-five in Chronicles.

letter *f*)¹; the short vowel is regularly retained before *S^{wa}d*: before *S^{wa}d simplex* in the form of an *i*, attenuated from *ā*: before a *Hateph* the prefix takes the vowel of the *Hateph*, e.g. לְפֵרִי for fruit, בְּאַרִי as a lion, בְּעָנִי *bō'nt*, in affliction (sometimes with the syllable subsequently closed, comp. § 28. *b*, and the infinitives with לְ, § 63. *i*): before weak consonants it follows the rule given in § 24. *c*, e.g. לִיהוּדָה for לְיָ. When the prefixes בְּ, לְ, כְּ, וְ, הֶ precede אֱלֹהִים God, the *S^{wa}d* and *Hateph S^{ghl}* regularly coalesce in *S^{wh}*, e.g. בְּאֱלֹהִים, &c., for בְּאֵלִי; so with suffixes וְאֱלֹהֵי, &c. (once also in the sing., וְאֱלֹהֵי Hab. 1, 11); also regularly לְאִמֹר to say, for לְאִמֹר, see § 23. *d*.

e (b) When the prefixes precede the article, the ה is almost always dropped, and they take its vowel. See further in § 35. *n*.

f (c) Immediately before the tone-syllable, i.e. before monosyllables and disyllables with the tone on the penultima (in the fore-tone), they take *Qameṣ* (undoubtedly a lengthening of an original *ā*, comp. § 26. *e*, § 28. *a*), but only in the following cases:

(aa) לְ before infinitives of the above-mentioned form, as לְתַתּוּ to give, לְדִין to judge, לְבֹז to plunder, לְנוּ to shear, לְחַג to keep a festival, לְבָרַח to bring forth, לְלָכֶת to go, לְסָחֶת to take, except when the infinitive (as a *nomen regens*) is closely connected with another word (especially its subject, § 115. *e*), and consequently, as being in a sort of *constr. state*, loses the principal tone, e.g. לְיָצֵאת Ex. 19, 1, לְשָׁכֶת Gen. 16, 3 (in such cases as לְהוֹדִיעַרָב Ex. 5, 21 the *ā* is protected by the secondary tone; before infinitives of verbs עָצַל, the לְ is retained even in close connexion; comp. Ezek. 21, 20. 25. 22, 3);

g (bb) before many pronominal forms, e.g. בֵּינוֹ (so also in 1 Sam. 21, 10; not בֵּינוֹה, לָהּ, בֵּינוֹה, לָהּ, לָאֵת (in close connexion, however, לָאֵת Gen. 2, 23; לָאֵת Gen. 45, 23); בְּאֵלֶּה as these; and especially בְּכֶם, לְכֶם, בְּכֶם (בְּכֶם) and בָּהֶם, לָהֶם, see § 103. *e*;¹

h (cc) before monosyllables or fore-toned nouns in such combinations as לְפֶה לְפֶה mouth to mouth, 2 Ki. 10, 21, בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם between waters and waters, Gen. 1, 6; לְטָרַח for a trouble, Is. 1, 14, but always before the principal pause. The instructive example in Deut. 17, 8, also shows that the punctuation לְ requires at least the lesser pause after it; in Is. 28, 10 and 13 the לְ is twice repeated, even before the small and smallest distinctives;

i (dd) in certain standing expressions, which have become stereotyped almost as adverbs, e.g. לְעַד to eternity, כָּרֶב in multitude, לְבִטָּח in security, לְעֶלְמָא to eternity, but לְעֶלְמָא לְעֶלְמָא to all eternity, Is. 34, 10. Cf. also לְנַפְשָׁא for the dead, Lev. 19, 28. Num. 5, 2. 9, 10.

k (d) With the interrogative מָה they are pointed as in מָה; in pause and before א as in מָה by what? (before a following relative clause, as in Eccles. 3, 22, מָה; comp. Delitzsch, *Jesaja*, 4th ed., on Is. 2, 22); מָה how much? but also מָה 2 Chron. 18, 15, in close connexion, and at a greater distance from the pause. The *S^{ghl}* in these forms arises from a partial lengthening of the

¹ Jerome (see Siegfried, *ZAW.* iv. 79) almost always represents בְּ by *da*.

original *ā*, while the *ḥ* is sharpened in order to maintain the original *ā* of the prefixes.

When לְ (prop. *la*) is united to לָמָּה, it takes, according to § 49. *f, g*, the form לָמָּהּ (Job 7, 20 לָמָּהּ, 1 Sam. 1, 8 לָמָּהּ, all *Mil'el*, and hence the *ā* in the tone is lengthened to *ā*) for *what? why?* Before the gutturals א, ה, ע, לָמָּהּ is used for euphonic reasons (exceptions 1 Sam. 28, 15. 2 Sam. 14, 31. Jer. 15, 18, before ה; 2 Sam. 2, 22. Ps. 49, 6, before א); לָמָּהּ, however, remains before ה. Before letters which are not gutturals, לָמָּהּ is found in Ps. 42, 10. 43, 2 (immediately after a tone-syllable).

Rem. The divine name יהוה, which has not its own original vowels (probably *mh* יהוה) but those of אֱלֹהֵי (see § 17. *c*), takes the prefixes also, after the manner of אֱלֹהֵי, thus יהוה, ויהוה, ליהוה, ביהוה, מיהוה (since they are to be read אֱלֹהֵי, וְאֱלֹהֵי, לְאֱלֹהֵי, בְּאֱלֹהֵי, מִן אֱלֹהֵי); for the א of אֱלֹהֵי, as of אֱלֹהִים, &c. (see below), *quiesces* after the prefixes ב, ג, ל, י, but is *audible* after ח (for חן), ש (no instance in the O. T.), and ה (in הַאֲרָמִים, the article, not ה' interrog., is intended, since the only example with ה' interrog., Jer. 8, 19, is to be pointed הַיְהוָה, i. e. הַיְהוָה, not הַיְהוָה). Hence the rule, מֹשֶׁה מוֹצֵא מֹשֶׁה Moses brought out (i. e. מ, ש, ה, make the א audible), וְכָלֵב טָבֵיבִים and Caleb brought in (i. e. י, כ, ב, ל, allow it to quiesce)¹.—As regards the other plural forms of אֲדָרְכִי, syncope of the א always takes place after ב, ג, ל, except in the form אֲדָרְכִי, thus אֲדָרְכִי, לְאֲדָרְכִי, &c.; but אֲדָרְכִי, &c., אֲדָרְכֵי, &c.

§ 103. *Prepositions with Pronominal Suffixes and in the Plural Form.*

1. As all prepositions were originally nouns (§ 101) in the accusative, *a* they may be united with the noun-suffixes (§ 91. *b-l*), e. g. אֵצֶל (prop. at my side) *by me*, אֵצֶי, (in my proximity) *with me*, אֵצֶיהֶם (in their place) *instead of them*, like the Latin *mea causa*, *for my sake*.

Rem. 1. The preposition אֵצֶל (usually אֵצֶל *near, with*, is distinguished from אֵצֶל (comp. note 1, p. 380), the sign of the definite accusative (§ 117. *a*), in its connexion with suffixes, by a difference of pointing, the former making אֵצֶל, אֵצֶל, in *pause* אֵצֶל, and fem. אֵצֶל (Is. 54, 10 אֵצֶל), אֵצֶל, אֵצֶל, (also in the later Books, especially in Kings, and in Jer. and Ezek., incorrectly אֵצֶל *with me*; אֵצֶל *from thee*, 1 Ki. 20, 25; אֵצֶל *from him*, 1 Ki. 22, 7; אֵצֶל *with them*), while the latter retains its original *o* before the light suffixes. Hence the following forms arise:—

	Sing.	Plur.
1.	אֵצֶל <i>me</i> .	אֵצֶל <i>us</i> .
2.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ אֵצֶל, } \text{pause} \text{ אֵצֶל} \\ f. \text{ אֵצֶל} \dots\dots \end{array} \right\} \text{thee.}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{אֵצֶל} \text{ you.} \\ \dots\dots \end{array} \right\}$
3.	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ אֵצֶל} \text{ him.} \\ f. \text{ אֵצֶל} \text{ her.} \end{array} \right\}$	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{אֵצֶל, } \text{אֵצֶל} \\ \text{אֵצֶל, } \text{אֵצֶל} \end{array} \right\} \text{them.}$

¹ Another *vox memor.* is כֻּלָּם בְּכֵלֵבוֹ *all is hidden in him*.

Less common are the *plene* forms אֶתְּי, אֶתְּךָ (Num. 22, 33 אֶתְּכָה before ה), אֶתְּהָ (Ex. 29, 35 אֶתְּכָה), אֶתְּהוּ, אֶתְּהוּ, אֶתְּהוּ. Moreover, for אֶתְּכֶם we find אֶתְּכֶם Jos. 23, 15; for אֶתְּם, five times (Gen. 32, 1. Ex. 18, 20, &c.), אֶתְּהֶם, and in Ezek. 23, 45 אֶתְּהֶם; for אֶתְּן (only found in Ezek. 16, 54; 35, 26 אֶתְּנָה; 34, 21 אֶתְּנָה) also אֶתְּנֶן (Gen. 19, 8, &c. [13 times]) and אֶתְּנֶן Ezek. 23, 47.—No instance of the 2nd fem. plur. אֶתְּכֶן occurs in the O. T.; in Cant. 2, 7, &c., אֶתְּכֶם is used instead.

- c 2. The preposition עִם *with* (with suffixes on the model of stems עָמַי, עָמְךָ, עָמְהָ [1 Sam. 1, 26 עָמְכָה, in pause עָמְךָ; 2nd fem. עָמְהָ, עָמְהָ] is united with the suffixes נִי, כֶּם and הָ by a (pretonic) *Qames*, which causes the sharpening of the *Mem* to be distinctly audible: עָמְטִי, עָמְכֶם, עָמְהֶם (so in Num. 22, 21, and often in very late passages, otherwise עָמָם is generally used). In the first person, besides עָמְי, we also find עָמְדִי (probably from original עָמְדִי; cf. Arab. *inda*, beside, with).

- d 3. It is but seldom that prepositions occur with verbal suffixes, as אֶתְּחִי 2 Sam. 22, 37. 40. 48 (for which Ps. 18, 37. 40. 48 אֶתְּחִי), אֶתְּחִיָּה Gen. 2, 21 and אֶתְּחִיָּה Ps. 139, 11 (here probably for the sake of the rhyme with אֶתְּחִיָּה).

- e 2. When pronominal suffixes are added to the prefixes (§ 102), there appears occasionally, especially in the case of the shorter suffixes, an endeavour to lengthen the preposition, so as to give it more strength and body. Hence to אֶתְּ is appended the syllable מו (see the Rem.), and אֶתְּ and אֶתְּ take at least a full vowel, אֶתְּ and אֶתְּ (§ 102. d, f).—The following deviations from the analogy of the noun with suffixes are to be noticed (a) in the pausal forms אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ (not *békha*, &c.); (b) in the similar forms with the suffix of the 2nd sing. fem. (not *békā*, &c.), and in אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ, &c. (not *bēnā*, &c.).

f (a) אֶתְּ with Pronominal Suffixes.

	Sing.	Plur.
1.	אֶתְּ to me.	אֶתְּ to us.
2.	<div> <div> <div>m. אֶתְּ (אֶתְּ), in pause אֶתְּ</div> <div>f. אֶתְּ</div> </div> <div>to thee.</div> </div>	<div> <div>אֶתְּ</div> <div>[אֶתְּ] אֶתְּ</div> </div> <div>to you.</div>
3.	<div> <div>m. אֶתְּ to him.</div> <div>f. אֶתְּ to her.</div> </div>	<div> <div>אֶתְּ, poet. אֶתְּ</div> <div>אֶתְּ, אֶתְּ</div> </div> <div>to them.</div>

¹ *First* and *best* (in me), in vulgar Arabic for *fi* and *bi*, are compared by Socin.

² אֶתְּ does not occur in the Old Testament, by a mere accident, no doubt; Ezek. 13, 18 אֶתְּ.

³ The question whether אֶתְּ can also stand for the sing. אֶתְּ, which Rödiger positively denied, must now decidedly be answered in the affirmative, since the

א takes suffixes in the same manner: אֲנִי, אָנֹכִי (Ex. 7, 29. 2 Sam. 8 22, 30. Ps. 141, 8 אָנֹכִי, as in Gen. 27, 37. 2 Sam. 18, 22. Is. 3, 6 אָנֹכִי), אָנֹכִי, &c.; except that for the 3rd plur., besides אֲנֵם (especially in the later Books) and אֲנֵיהֶם (only in Ex. 36, 1. Hab. 1, 16; אֲנֵיהֶם only in Jer. 14, 16), the form אֲנִי is also used; and for the feminine, besides אֲנִיָּהּ (which occurs three times), אֲנִיָּהּ is found fifteen times, and אֲנִיָּהּ, but only in 1 Sam. 31, 7. Is. 38, 16. Ezek. 42, 14.—According to the Masora, אֲנִי is found fifteen times for אֲנִי (as conversely in 1 Sam. 2, 16. 20, 2 אֲנִי for אֲנִי), e.g. Ex. 21, 8. 1 Sam. 2, 3. Is. 9, 2. Ps. 100, 3 (and, as has been conjectured, also Job 41, 4); comp. Delitzsch on Ps. 100, 3.—In Num. 32, 42. Zech. 5, 11. Ruth 2, 14, the Masora requires אֲנִי instead of אֲנִי (in all three places before a following tone-syllable; comp. § 23. *k*, and the analogous cases of the loss of *Mappiq* in § 58. *g*, § 91. *e*).

(b) א with Pronominal Suffixes.

h

	Sing.	Plur.
1.	אֲנִי as I.	אֲנֵם as we.
2.	$\left. \begin{matrix} m. \text{ אָנֹכִי} \\ f. \dots \end{matrix} \right\} \text{as thou.}$	$\left. \begin{matrix} m. \text{ אָנֹכֶם, אָנֹכֶם, seldom אָנֹכֶם} \\ \dots \end{matrix} \right\} \text{as ye.}$
3.	$\left. \begin{matrix} m. \text{ אֲנִיָּהּ} \\ f. \text{ אֲנִיָּהּ} \end{matrix} \right\} \text{as he.}$	$\left. \begin{matrix} m. \text{ אֲנֵם, [אֲנֵהֶם, אֲנֵהֶם]} \\ f. \text{ אֲנֵהֶם, אֲנֵהֶם} \end{matrix} \right\} \text{as they.}$

Phoenician suffix of the 3rd pers. sing. in א has been universally recognized as the ground-form of the Hebrew suffixes in אֲנִי (comp. Schröder, *Phöniz. Sprache*, p. 153 sqq. and p. 154 for Schlottmann's explanation of this אֲנִי). It is true that in such places as Gen. 9, 26. 27. Deut. 33, 2. Is. 30, 5. Ps. 73, 10 (all *in* or immediately before the principal pause; in Deut. 33, 2 with *Zaqeph qaton* at least) אֲנִי can be better explained as plural (in reference to collective nouns); and in Is. 53, 8 for אֲנִי we should read with the LXX אֲנֵם. On the other hand, in Is. 44, 15 its explanation as plural would be extremely forced. Even then there would remain—presuming the traditional text to be correct—אֲנִי Ps. 11, 7 and אֲנִי Job 27, 23, as well as אֲנִי, the last occurring three times, Job 20, 23. 27, 23 (beside אֲנִי), and especially Job 22, 2. In all these places the most extreme exegetical artifices can only be avoided by simply admitting a singular suffix (= אֲנִי, אֲנִי, אֲנִי).

⁴ The form אֲנִי occurs in Ruth 1, 13 in the sense of *therefore*.

⁵ The use of אֲנִי here for אֲנִי (cf. above, letter *d*) might be due to euphonic reasons. Probably, however, it is a case of contraction from אֲנִי אֲנִי, see letter *k*.—אֲנִי (defectively) only in the Pentateuch, אֲנִי Ex. 15, 11.

i

(c) **מן** with Pronominal Suffixes.

Sing.

Plur.

1. **מִנִּי**, poet. **מִנִּי**, in pause also **מִנֵּנוּ** from us.
מִנִּי from me.
2. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ מִיָּךְ, in pause מִיָּךְ } \\ f. \text{ מִיָּךְ } \end{array} \right\}$ from thee. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ מִיָּךְ } \\ f. \text{ מִיָּךְ } \end{array} \right\}$ from you.
3. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ מִנּוֹ, Job 4, 12 in pause מִנּוֹ,} \\ \text{[מִנּוֹ or מִנּוֹ]} \text{ from him.} \\ f. \text{ מִנּוֹ from her.} \end{array} \right\}$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} m. \text{ מִנּוֹ, poet.} \\ f. \text{ מִנּוֹ} \end{array} \right\}$ from them.

k The syllable **מ** (in Arabic *mā* **مَا** = Heb. **מָה** what) in **מִמֶּנִּי** (probably from **מִמֶּנִּי**, prop. according to what I, for as I) is, in poetry, appended to the three simple prefixes **א**, **ב**, **ל**, even without suffixes, so that **מִמֶּנִּי**, **מִמֶּנִּי**, **מִמֶּנִּי** appear as independent words, equivalent in meaning to **א**, **ב**, **ל**. Poetry is here distinguished from prose by the use of longer forms; in the case of **מן**, on the other hand, it prefers the shorter, which resemble the Syriac and Arabic.

l The form **מִמֶּנִּי**, enclosed in brackets above, occurs only in 2 Ki. 17, 15 (in pause), **מִמֶּנִּי** only in Jer. 36, 52 (in pause); **מִמֶּנִּי** (Baer following Qimhi **מִמֶּנִּי**) only in Ezek. 18, 14. Comp. Frensdorff, *Massora Magna*, p. 234 sqq.—For **מִמֶּנִּי** as *ye* Qimhi requires **מִמֶּנִּי** (invariably or only in Job 16, 4?); in Jos. 1, 15. Jud. 8, 2. Ezra 4, 2 Baer gives **מִמֶּנִּי**.

m With regard to **מן** with suffixes, **מִמֶּנִּי** from me is usually explained as arising, by a reduplication of **מן**, from an original **מִמֶּנִּי**, just as **מִמֶּנִּי** from him, from **מִמֶּנִּי**, identical in form with **מִמֶּנִּי**¹ from us, from **מִמֶּנִּי**, while **מִמֶּנִּי** from her goes back to **מִמֶּנִּי**. Far simpler, however, is Mayer Lambert's explanation (*Revue des études juives*, xxiii. 302 sqq.), that **מִמֶּנִּי**, &c., have arisen from **מִמֶּנִּי**, &c., and that the forms of the suffixes are to be explained on the analogy of **מִמֶּנִּי**, **מִמֶּנִּי**, **מִמֶּנִּי**, § 100. o.—The bracketed form **מִמֶּנִּי**, for which Baer, following Qimhi and others, writes **מִמֶּנִּי**, occurs only in Ps. 68, 24, and is there regarded by Delitzsch, Hupfeld and others (following Simonis) as a substantive (**מן** = portion). The expression **מִמֶּנִּי** (for **מִמֶּנִּי**?) Is. 18, 2. 7 is very strange.—**מִמֶּנִּי** occurs only in Jer. 10, 2. Eccles. 12, 12 (Job 11, 20 **מִמֶּנִּי**); **מִמֶּנִּי** (so Baer and Ginsburg, following the best authorities, instead of the ordinary reading **מִמֶּנִּי**) only in Ezek. 16, 47. 52.

n 3. Several prepositions, especially those which express relations of space and time, are (like the German *wegen*) properly plural nouns (for the reason, see § 124. a), and are, therefore, joined with the

¹ The Babylonian Masora writes **מִמֶּנִּי** (to distinguish it from the 3rd sing.), which is justly blamed by Ibn Ezra.

pronominal suffixes in the form of the plural *construct state*, just like other plural nouns (§ 91. g). On the other hand, the apparent connexion of *לְ*, *עַד*, *אֶל* with plural suffixes is explained from the ground-forms of those prepositions (from stems *ל'ה* *אֶלִי* (*אֶלִי*), *עַדִי*, *עַלִי* (contracted to *אֶלִי*, *אֶלִי*, &c.)¹.

Without suffixes these prepositions are—

אֲחֵרִי, more frequently *אֲחֵרִי* (prop. *hinder parts*) *behind, after*.

אֶל, poet. also *אֶלִי* (*region, direction*), *towards, to, according to*.

בֵּין (*interval*) *between*; the suffixes indicating the singular are added to the singular *בֵּין*, thus *בֵּינִי*, *בֵּינְךָ*, &c. (Gen. 16, 5 *בֵּינִיךָ*, the second *Yddh* is, however, marked with a point as critically doubtful; *בֵּינִי*, which occurs three times, is only the Masoretic *Qrē* for *בֵּינוֹ*, which is found e.g. in Gen. 30, 36). On the other hand, the suffixes indicating a plural are attached to the plural forms *בֵּינֵינוּ* or *בֵּינֵיכֶם*.

סָבִיב (*circuit*) *around*, with suffixes always has the plural form, sometimes masc. *סָבִיבֵיךָ*, &c., sometimes, and more frequently, in the fem. *סָבִיבוֹת* (*surroundings*). In Ezek. 43, 17 *סָבִיב אֲחֵרֵי* is abnormal for *סָבִיבֵיהָ*.

עַד (*continuation, duration*, from *עָדָה*) *as far as, unto*, poet. *עַדִי*. In Job 32, 12 *עַדִיכֶם*, with the *ā* retained in the secondary tone, is abnormal. Also in 2 Ki. 9, 18 for *עַדֵיהֶם* read *עַדֵיהֶם*.

עַל *upon, over* (comp. the subst. *עָלָה* *height, the top*, from *עָלָה* *to ascend*), poet. *עַלִי*.

תַּחַת *under* (prop. *what is beneath*). On *תַּחַתֵּי*, &c., comp. above, letter *d*.

¹ The reference of these forms to original plurals has been again expressly supported by De Lagarde, *Symmicta*, ii. 101 sqq.; *Nachrichten der G. g. G.*, 1881, p. 376, cf. *Mittheilungen*, 1884, p. 63; also *GGA.*, 1884, p. 280 sq. According to Barth, *ZDMG*. xlii. p. 348 sqq., and *Nominalbildung*, p. 375 sqq., *תַּחַתֵּי*, &c., was only formed on the analogy of *עַלֵּי*, &c., and *אֲחֵרֵי*, &c., only on the analogy of *לִסְנֵי*, &c., since the real plural forms ought to be *תַּחַתֵּיךָ*, *תַּחַתֵּינוּ*, &c.; cf., however, König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 305 sq.

With Suffixes.

	אֲחֵרִי	בֵּינִי	סְבִיבוֹתַי	תַּחְתִּי	אֵלַי	עָדָי	עָלָי
1 Sing.	(after me)	(between me)	(around me)	(beneath me)	(to me)	(unto me)	(on me)
2 S. m.	אֲחֵרֶיךָ	בֵּינֶךָ	סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ & סְבִיבֶיךָ	תַּחְתֶּיךָ	אֵלֶיךָ	עָדֶיךָ	עָלֶיךָ
2 S. f.	אֲחֵרֶיךָ		סְבִיבוֹתֶיךָ & סְבִיבֶיךָ		אֵלֶיךָ		עָלֶיךָ
3 S. m.	אֲחֵרָיו	בֵּינוֹ	סְבִיבוֹתָיו & סְבִיבָיו	תַּחְתָּיו	אֵלָיו	עָדָיו	עָלָיו
3 S. f.	אֲחֵרֶיהָ		סְבִיבוֹתֶיהָ & סְבִיבֶיהָ	תַּחְתֶּיהָ	אֵלֶיהָ	עָדֶיהָ	עָלֶיהָ
1 Plur.	אֲחֵרֵינוּ	בֵּינֵינוּ	סְבִיבוֹתֵינוּ & בִּינוֹתֵינוּ ¹	תַּחְתֵּינוּ	אֵלֵינוּ		עָלֵינוּ
2 Pl. m.	אֲחֵרֵיכֶם	בֵּינֵיכֶם	סְבִיבוֹתֵיכֶם	תַּחְתֵּיכֶם	אֵלֵיכֶם	עָדֵיכֶם	עָלֵיכֶם
3 Pl. m.	אֲחֵרֵיהֶם	בֵּינֵיהֶם	סְבִיבוֹתֵיהֶם & בִּינוֹתָם	תַּחְתֵּיהֶם usually תַּחְתָּם	אֵלֵיהֶם & אֵלֵיהֶם ¹	[עָדֵיהֶם]	עָלֵיהֶם [עָלֵיהֶם ¹]
3 Pl. f.	אֲחֵרֵיהֶן			תַּחְתֵּיהֶן	אֵלֵיהֶן & אֵלֵיהֶן		עָלֵיהֶן

§ 104. Conjunctions.

a 1. The conjunctions serve to connect sentences, and to express their relations one to another. They may be either—

(a) Original pronouns, e.g. the demonstrative *כִּי* that, because, for.

(b) Original substantives, which afterwards were reduced to the rank of pronouns, adverbs or conjunctions; so probably *אֲשֶׁר* (see § 36), which is sometimes used to express the general idea of relation, sometimes as a relative pronoun (= *qui, quae, quod*), and in many cases stands simply for *כִּי*; also *אֵל* (nothing), that not; *כִּי* that not (the Greek *μη* of prohibition), &c. To these may be added the

¹ As Mayer Lambert observes, usage (cf. esp. Gen. 26, 28) distinguishes between the two forms: *בֵּינוֹ* means *between us and you*, whereas *בֵּינֵנוּ* (Jos. 22, 25. 27. 28 before *וּבֵינֵנוּ*) means *between us on the one hand*.

² The poetical form *אֵלֵינוּ* only in Ps. 2, 5; *עָלֵינוּ*, on which see note 3 on letter *f*, frequently.

adverbial combination of substantives with prepositions, e.g. **בְּמִקְדָּם** (*in the not yet*) *earlier, before*, for which **מִקְדָּם** is also used. On the combination of two particles to express complex ideas (e.g. **וְאֵתְּ** *added to this, that=much more*), see Syntax.

(c) Prepositions, which with the addition of the conjunction **אֲשֶׁר** *b* or **כִּי** together form one single conjunction, e.g. **אֲשֶׁר עַל** *because, prop. on account of the fact that*; **אֲחֵר אֲשֶׁר**, and more frequently **אֲחֵרִי אֲשֶׁר**, *after that*; **כַּאֲשֶׁר** *according as* (with **כִּי**); **עַקֵּב אֲשֶׁר** and **עַקֵּב** *in consequence of the fact that, for the reason that, because*. Sometimes, however, the conjunction in such cases is omitted, and the preposition itself used as a conjunction, e.g. **עַל** (for **עַל־אֲשֶׁר**) *although*, Job 16, 17.

So, at any rate, according to our linguistic principles. It would, however, be more correct to say, that instead of the intermediary **אֲשֶׁר** the whole of the succeeding sentence is regarded as *one* substantival idea, under the immediate government of the preposition. In the same way, all prepositions governing the gerund in English may be paraphrased by conjunctions with the finite verb, see §§ 114 and 115, *passim*.

2. Besides those already mentioned, there are certain other small *c* words now used as conjunctions, of which the derivation or original meaning is altogether obscure, thus **אִם** *or*, **אִם־אִם** *if* (also *or* before the second member of a double question), **אֲנִי** *also*, **וְ** *and*, and others.

Rem. The pointing of the **י** (originally **י**), as still before *Ḥaṭeph Pathah*, and— *d* with a following *Dageš forte*—in *wāw* consecutive of the imperfect; cf. § 49. *f*) is in many respects analogous to that of the prefixes **בְּ**, **כִּי**, **לְ** (§ 102. *d-i*), but as being a weak consonant, the *wāw* copulative has some further peculiarities:

(a) Usually it takes simple *Ṣwā* (**י**).

(b) Before words which begin with a guttural having a compound *Ṣwā*, it takes the vowel with which the *Ṣwā* is compounded (according to § 28. *b*), e.g. **וְחִכָּם** *and be thou wise*, **וְעֲבָדִים** *and servants*, **וְעֹז** *and strength*, **וְאָכַל** *and eat thou*, **וְחִלִּי** *and sickness*. On **וְאֵלֶיךָ**, **וְאֵלֶיךָ**, &c., see § 102. *d*; on **וְאֵלֶיךָ**, &c., see § 102. *m*; on such cases as **וְאֵלֶיךָ** Job 4, 2, comp. § 28. *b*.

(c) Before words with simple *Ṣwā* under the first consonant (except in the *e* cases under letter *f*), the *Wāw* becomes the vowel *wā*, e.g. **וְאֵלֶיךָ** *and to all*, so also (except in the case under letter *g*) before the cognate labials **בְּ**, **מְ**, **דְ**, hence **וְאֵלֶיךָ**. On the cases in which simple *Ṣwā* has become a *Ḥaṭeph* after **י** copulative (e.g. **וְאֵלֶיךָ** Gen. 2, 12), comp. § 10. *h*.

(d) With a following **י** the **י** coalesces to form **יְ** according to § 24. *b*, e.g. **וְיָהִי** *and let him be*. On the peculiar punctuation of the *wāw* copulative before forms with initial *Ṣwā* from **הָיָה** *to be* and **חָיָה** *to live* (e.g. **וְהָיָה** Jos. 8, 4, **וְחָיָה** Gen. 20, 7), comp. § 63. *q*.

g (e) Immediately before the tone-syllable it frequently takes *Qames*, like בְּ, בַּ, לְ (see § 102. f), but in most cases only at the end of a sentence or clause (but cf. also וְכֵן 2 Ki. 22, 30), e.g. וְיָמֹת Ex. 21, 12 (on the other hand, in verse 20 וְיָמֹת is in closer logical connexion with what follows); 2 Ki. 7, 4 $\text{וְיָמֹתָם שָׁמַיִם}$ and וְיָמֹתָם ; Ruth 3, 3 וְיָמֹתָהּ ; Ps. 10, 15 וְיָרֵעַ ; 1 Sam. 9, 4 וְיָמִין ; 2 Sam. 13, 26 וְיָמִין ; Ezek. 47, 9 וְיָחִי ; comp. also (with *Tiphha*) Gen. 33, 13. 2 Sam. 15, 12. The very frequent connexion of nouns expressing kindred ideas, by means of וְ , is due simply to considerations of rhythm, for even in such cases the *Waw* must immediately precede the tone-syllable, which must be marked by a disjunctive accent, e.g. $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Gen. 1, 2, $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Gen. 8, 22 (see also the previous examples); Gen. 13, 14 (thrice); Ex. 25, 3 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$; Ps. 96, 7 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$; Ps. 76, 7 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$; Gen. 7, 13 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$; 1 Ki. 21, 10 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ thus and thus; Est. 1, 8 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ at the end of the verse, but in Ps. 87, 5 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$, in spite of the *D'shi* with the second וְיָמֹתָהּ , because it is closely connected with the following predicate. Also with three words $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Is. 24, 17. On the other hand, the rapid pronunciation וְ occurs before a conjunctive accent (and, when farther removed from the principal pause, even with the smaller disjunctives, in spite of a following tone-syllable), e.g. $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Gen. 32, 6; comp. Gen. 31, 40. Lev. 7, 23. Deut. 2, 21, and among the examples given above, Gen. 7, 13 and Ps. 76, 7. (Exceptions: $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Gen. 13, 14, where evidently the וְ is intended to ensure the slow and solemn recitation of the promise, but also $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Jos. 15, 55, $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ 19, 7, $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ 19, 25, all immediately before the pause.) For the same rhythmical reason וְ (not וְ) is used regularly with certain monosyllables which, by their nature, lean more closely upon the following word, thus $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$, $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$, $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ and others (to be distinguished from $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ if not, with *Zaqeph gadol*, 2 Ki. 5, 17).

§ 105. Interjections.

- a 1. Among the interjections some (as in all other languages) are simply natural sounds, or, as it were, vocal gesticulations, called forth involuntarily by certain impressions or sensations, e.g. $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (Ezek. 30, 2 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *ah!* $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *aha!* (comp. this $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ also in $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ and $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *utnam!*), $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Ex. 32, 31, &c. (Gen. 50, 17 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *ah!* (from $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ and $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$), otherwise written $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ 2 Ki. 20, 3. Jon. 1, 14. Ps. 116, 4; also $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (in pause $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$, even in the plural $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *hold your peace!* Neh. 8, 11) *hush!* $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (Amos 5, 16 $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *ha! woe!* $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (Ps. 120, 5), $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (in $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ Eccles. 4, 10; $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ 10, 16) *woe!*
- b 2. Others, however, originally expressed independent ideas, and become interjections only by rapid pronunciation and by usage, e.g. $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (נָא) or $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *behold!* (prop. *here*); $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ *behold!* (prop. imperative); $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$, plur. $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$ (prop. *give*, imperative of $\text{וְיָמֹתָהּ וְיָמֹתָהּ}$; comp. as to the tone,

§ 69. *o*), the Latin *age, agile, come on!* לָכֹה (also לָךְ), לָכוּ (prop. *go*, imperative of לָךְ) with the same meaning¹; הֲלֵלָהּ *far be it!* (prop. *ad profanum!*) בִּי (see the Lexicon) *I beseech, hear me!* נָא *pray!* used to emphasize a demand, warning, or entreaty, and always placed after the expression to which it belongs².

¹ רָאָה (Deut. 1, 8), הִבָּהּ and לָכֹה are also used in connexion with the feminine and the plural, which proves that they have become quite stereotyped as interjections.

² נָא serves to express the most various shades of expression, which are discussed in the various parts of the syntax. It is used especially (*a*) after the imperative, either in commands or entreaty, see § 110. *d*; (*b*) with the imperfect, either in the cohortative (§ 108. *b*) or jussive (§ 109. *b*); (*c*) once with perfect, Gen. 40, 14; (*d*) after various particles: נָא הִנֵּה *behold now*; particularly after the conjunctions וְ and כִּי: נָא וְנִלְכֵם *ne quaeso* and נָא כִּי *if now, if now, if now, if*, in a deprecatory sense, expressive of politeness or modesty. In Num. 12, 13 נָא stands after a noun; but we ought certainly to read נָא וְלֵךְ.—In polite language this particle is used constantly in a variety of ways, Gen. 18, 3 sq. 19, 7 sq. 19, and 50, 17.

³ Against the usual view which regards נָא as a hortatory particle (= *up! come!* analogous to the original imperatives הִבָּהּ and לָכֹה and the Eth. *nā'd*, properly *hither*, also *come!*), P. Haupt, in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii, no. 114, p. 109, justly observes that we should then expect the particle to be prefixed to the imperative, &c. He proposes to describe נָא as an emphatic particle. Haupt's suggested identification of this נָא with the Assyrian, Arabic and Ethiopic particle *mā* (which is also an enclitic of emphasis), and ultimately with the interrogative *mā*, we shall not discuss here.

THIRD PART.

SYNTAX.

CHAPTER I.

THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

I. Syntax of the Verb.

A. USE OF THE TENSES AND MOODS¹.

§ 106. Use of the Perfect.

- a* The perfect serves to express actions, events, or conditions, which the speaker wishes to represent as in a state of completion, whether they belong to a determinate past time, or extend into the present, or, while still future, are thought of in their completed state.

The definition formerly given here ('the perfect serves to express *completed* actions') applies, strictly speaking, only to some of the varieties of the perfect discussed in letters *b-p*: hence the above modification based on the arguments of Knudtzon (for the title see note 1, and cf. further § 107. *a*).

More particularly the uses of the perfect may be distinguished as follows:—

- b* 1. To represent actions, events, or conditions, which, after a shorter

¹ Comp. the sketch of the tenses and moods used in Hebrew in § 40; and on the general characteristics of the perfect and imperfect see the note on § 47. *a*; also Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (Oxford, 1874; 3rd ed. 1892); Bennett, 'Notes on the Use of the Hebrew Tenses' (*Hebraica*, 1886, vols. ii, iii). A partial modification of the accepted definition of the Semitic perfect and imperfect was proposed by J. A. Knudtzon, *Om det saakaldte Perfektum og Imperfektum i Hebraisk*, Kristiania, 1890; of which a summary entitled *Vom sogenannten Perf. und Imperf. im Hebr.* appeared in the *Transactions of the Oriental Congress at Stockholm*, section sémitique *b*, p. 73 sqq. (Leyden, 1892). Cf. also Knudtzon's articles, 'Zur assyrischen und allgemein semitischen Grammatik' in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, especially vi. 422 sqq. and vii. 33 sqq.

or longer duration, were terminated in the past, and hence are finally concluded, viz.:

(a) Corresponding to the perfect proper in Latin and the English *δ* perfect definite, in assertions, negations, confirmations, interrogations, &c., e.g. Gen. 18, 15 *then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed not.* (לֹא צָחַקְתִּי); and *he said, Nay, but thou didst laugh* (צָחַקְתִּי); Gen. 3, 11 *וְהוּא הָיָה לֵךְ* *who told thee . . . ?* Comp. 3, 13. 14. 17. 22. Also pointing to some undefined time in the past, e.g. Is. 66, 8 *מִי שָׁמַע בְּזֹאת* *who hath (ever yet) heard such a thing?*

Rem. In opposition to this express use of the perfect to emphasize the completion of an event, the imperfect is not infrequently used to emphasize that which is still future, e.g. Jos. 1, 5 *as I was* (הָיִיתִי) *with Moses, so will I be* (אֶהְיֶה) *with thee*; Jos. 1, 17. Ex. 10, 14. Deut. 32, 21. 1 Ki. 2, 38. Is. 46, 4. 11. Joel 2, 2. Eccles. 1, 9.

(δ) As a simple *tempus historicum* (corresponding to the Greek *d aorist*) in narrating past events, e.g. Gen. 4, 4 *and Abel, he also brought* (וַהֲבִיֵּא), &c.; Gen. 7, 20 *the waters did prevail* (וַיִּבְרֹךְ), &c.; Job 1, 1 *there was a man* (אִישׁ הָיָה) *in the land of Uz, &c.*; even in relating repeated actions, 1 Sam. 18, 30.

Rem. As the above examples indicate, the perfect of *narration* occurs especially *e* at the head of an entire narrative (Job 1, 1; comp. Dan. 2, 1) or an independent sentence (e.g. Gen. 7, 11. 13), but in co-ordinate sentences, as a rule, only when the verb is separated from the copulative ו by one or more words (comp. above Gen. 4, 4 and 7, 20). In other cases, the narrative is continued in the imperfect consecutive, according to § 111. *a*. The direct connexion of the narrative perfect with ו copulative (not to be confounded with the perfect consecutive proper, § 112) agrees rather with Aramaic syntax (comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 71, 1. *b*). On the examples (which are in many respects doubtful) in the earlier texts, see § 112. *pp-uu*.

(c) To represent actions, &c., which were already completed in *f* the past, at the time when other actions or conditions took place (pluperfect), e.g. 1 Sam. 28, 3 *now Samuel was (long since) dead*¹ . . . and *Saul had put away* (וַהֲסִיר) *those that had familiar spirits . . . out of the land*. Both these statements, being as it were in parentheses, merely assign a reason for the narrative beginning at verse 6. Comp. 1 Sam. 9, 15. 25, 21. 2 Sam. 18, 18.—Gen. 20, 18 (*for the Lord had fast closed up, &c.*); 27, 30. 31, 19. 34. Deut. 2, 10; and in a negative

¹ Incorrectly e.g. in the Vulgate, *Samuel autem mortuus est . . . et Saul abstulit magos, &c.*

statement, Gen. 2, 5 *for the Lord God had not* (up to that time) *caused it to rain, &c.* This is especially frequent, from the nature of the case, in relative, causal and temporal clauses, when the main clause contains a tense referring to the past, e.g. Gen. 2, 2 *and he rested . . . from all his work which he had made* (עָשָׂה); Gen. 7, 9, 19, 27, &c.; 29, 10 *now when Jacob had seen Rachel* (בָּאֵשֶׁר רָאָה) . . . , *Jacob went near, &c.*; so also in clauses which express the completion or incompleteness of an action, &c., on the occurrence of another event, as in Gen. 24, 15, 27, 30, &c.; cf. § 164. *b*, with the note, and letter *c*.

g 2. To represent actions, events or conditions, which, although completed in the past, nevertheless extend their influence into the present (in English generally rendered by the present):

(a) Expressing facts which were accomplished long before, or conditions and attributes which were acquired long before, but of which the effects still remain in the present (present perfect), e.g. Ps. 10, 11 הִסְתִּיר פָּנָיו *he hath hidden his face (and still keeps it hidden)*; Ps. 143, 6 פִּרְשֵׁתִי *I have spread forth my hands (and still keep them spread forth)*. This applies particularly to a large number of 'perfects' (almost exclusively of intransitive¹ verbs, denoting affections or conditions of the mind) which in English can be rendered only by the present, or, in the case mentioned above under letter *f*, by the imperfect². Thus, יָדַעְתִּי *I know* (prop. *I have perceived, have experienced*) Job 9, 2, 10, 13, יָדַעְתִּי לֹא *I know not* Gen. 4, 9, &c.; on the other hand, e.g. in Gen. 28, 16. Num. 22, 34, the context requires *I knew not*; וִזְכַּרְנוּ *we remember* Num. 11, 5; כָּאָנָה *she refuseth* Job 6, 7; עָלָץ *it exulteth*; שִׂמְחָתִי *I rejoice* 1 Sam. 2, 1; בָּקֵשׁ *he requireth* Is. 1, 12; קִוִּיתִי *I wait* Gen. 49, 18. Ps. 130, 5 (parallel with הוֹלֵלְתִּי); הִפְצֵתִי *I delight* Ps. 40, 9 (mostly negative, Is. 1, 11 and elsewhere); אָהַבְתִּי *I love* Gen. 27, 4; שָׂנְאָתִי *I hate* Ps. 31, 7; כָּאָסַתִּי *I despise* Amos 5, 21; תִּשְׁבְּטֵנִי *they abhor me* Job 30, 10; בָּטַחְתִּי *I trust* Ps. 25, 2; הִסִּיתִי *I put my trust* Ps. 31, 2; צַדִּיקְתִּי *I am righteous* Job 34, 5.—We may further include a number of verbs which express bodily characteristics or states, such as פָּרָלְתָּ *thou art great* Ps. 104, 1; קָטַנְתִּי *I am little* Gen. 32, 11;

¹ With regard to the great but very natural preponderance of intransitive verbs (expressing an existing condition), cf. the lists in Knudtzon (see above, note on letter *a*), pp. 117 and 122 in the Danish text.

² Cf. *noui, odi, memini*; *οἶδα, μέμνημαι, οἶκου, δίδωρκα, κέκραγα*; in the New Testament, *ἔλπικα, ἠγάπηκα*.

נָבְרוּ *they are high* Is. 55, 9; יַחֲזִיקוּ *they stand aloof* Job 30, 10; טָבוּ *they are goodly* Num. 24, 5; נָאוּ *they are beautiful* Is. 52, 7; זָקֵנִי *I am old* Gen. 18, 13; יָגַעְתִּי *I am weary* Ps. 6, 7; שָׂבַעְתִּי *I am full* Is. 1, 11, &c.

Rem. To the same category probably belong also the perfects after עֲדִימָהּ *h* Ex. 10, 3 *how long hast thou already been refusing* (and refusest still . . . ? which really amounts to *how long wilt thou refuse?*) Ps. 80, 5. Prov. 1, 22 (co-ordinate with the imperf.), and after עֲרֹאנָה Ex. 16, 28. Hab. 1, 2.

(b) In direct narration to express actions which, although really *i* only in process of accomplishment, are nevertheless meant to be represented as already accomplished in the conception of the speaker, e.g. הֶרַמְתִּי *I lift up* (my hand in ratifying an oath) Gen. 14, 22; נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי *I swear* Jer. 22, 5; הִעֲדֵיתִי *I testify* Deut. 8, 19; יִעֲצֵנִי *I counsel* 2 Sam. 17, 11 (but in a different context in ver. 15, *have I counselled*); אֶמְרֵתִי (prop. *I say*) *I decide* (*I consider as hereby settled*) 2 Sam. 19, 30; *I declare* Job 9, 22. 32, 10.

(c) To express facts which have formerly taken place, and are *k* still of constant recurrence, and hence are matters of common experience (the Greek *gnomic aorist*), e.g. Ps. 9, 11 *for thou, Lord, hast not forsaken* (לֹא עָזַבְתָּ) *them that seek thee*. Comp. ver. 13, also Ps. 10, 3. 119, 40 and Gen. 49, 11 (פָּבֵט).

Rem. In almost all the cases discussed in No. 2 (included under the English present) the imperfect can be used instead of the perfect, wherever the action or state in question is regarded, not as already completed, but as still continuing or just taking place (see § 107. a). Thus, לֹא יָכֹלְתִּי *I am not able* Ps. 40, 13 and לֹא אֵיבָל Gen. 31, 35 have practically the same meaning. Hence also it very frequently happens that the imperfect corresponds to such perfects in poetic or prophetic parallelism, e.g. Is. 5, 12. Ps. 2, 1 sq. Prov. 1, 22. Job 3, 17.

3. To express *future* actions, when the speaker intends by an *m* express assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts:

(a) In contracts or other express stipulations (again corresponding to the English present), e.g. Gen. 23, 11 *the field I give* (נָתַתִּי) *thee*; comp. ver. 13 and 48, 22. 2 Sam. 14, 21. 24, 23. Jer. 40, 4; in a threat, 1 Sam. 2, 16. 15, 2. 2 Sam. 5, 6 (unless, with Wellhausen, יִסְרֶךְ is to be read).—Especially in promises made by God, Gen. 1, 29. 15, 18. 17, 20. Jud. 1, 2.

(b) To express facts which are undoubtedly imminent, and, therefore, *n* in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished (*perfectum*

confidentiae), e.g. Num. 17, 27 **נָפְעַת אֲבִירֵי בְלֶט אֲבִירֵי** *behold, we perish, we are undone, we are all undone.* Gen. 30, 13. Is. 6, 5 (**נִרְמִיתִי** *I am undone*¹). Prov. 4, 2. Even in interrogative sentences, Gen. 18, 12. Num. 17, 28. 23, 10. Jud. 9, 9. 11. Zech. 4, 10 (?). Prov. 22, 20². This use of the perfect occurs most frequently in prophetic language (*perfectum propheticum*). The prophet so transports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been already seen or heard by him, e.g. Is. 5, 13 *therefore my people are gone into captivity* (**וְנָלָה**); 9, 1 sqq. 10, 28. 11, 9 (after **וְיָ**, as frequently elsewhere); 19, 7. Job 5, 20. 2 Chron. 20, 37. Not infrequently the imperfect interchanges with such perfects either in the parallel member or further on in the narrative.

- o (c) To express actions or facts, which are meant to be indicated as existing in the future in a completed state (*futurum exactum*), e.g. Is. 4, 4 **וְיָצָא אִם** *when he has washed away = when he shall have washed away* (an *imperfect* follows in the co-ordinate sentence; cf. the conditional sentences in § 107. x); Is. 6, 11 (after **אִם** **וְאֶשֶׁר**, as in Gen. 28, 15. Num. 32, 17; also 2 Sam. 17, 13 after **וְאֶשֶׁר**, Gen. 24, 19 after **אִם** **וְעַד** and elsewhere frequently after temporal conjunctions); Mic. 5, 2 (**וְיָלְדָהּ**); Gen. 43, 14 **וְאֲנִי בְּאִשֶּׁר שָׁכַלְתִּי שָׁכַלְתִּי** *and I—if I am bereaved (orbus fuero), I am bereaved*, an expression of despairing resignation. Comp. Prov. 23, 15. Est. 4, 16.

- p 4. To express actions and facts, whose accomplishment in the past is to be represented, not as actual, but only as possible (generally corresponding to the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive), e.g. Gen. 31, 42 *except the God of my father . . . had been with me, surely now hadst thou sent me away empty* (**וְשָׁלַחְתִּי**); Gen. 43, 10. Ex. 9, 15 (**וְשָׁלַחְתִּי** *I had almost put forth, &c.*); Num. 22, 33. Jud. 13, 23. 14, 18. 1 Sam. 13, 13 (**וְהִכִּין**); 2 Ki. 13, 19; so frequently after **קִמְצָם** *easily, almost*, Gen. 26, 10. Is. 1, 9 (where **קִמְצָם** is probably to be connected

¹ Comp. the similar use of *ἄλλα* (*διέφθορας*, II. 15, 128) and *perii!* On the kindred use of the perfect in conditional sentences, comp. below, letter *p*.

² In Gen. 40, 14 a *perf. confidentiae* (after **אִם** **וְיָ**, as in 2 Ki. 5, 20. 23, 9) appears to be used in the expression of an earnest desire that something may happen, *but have me in thy remembrance, &c.* Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a *precative* perfect in Hebrew. In Job 21, 16. 22, 18 also, translate the counsel of the wicked is far from me. Comp. Driver, *The Use of the Tenses*, p. 29 sqq.

with the word after it); Ps. 73, 2, 94, 17, 119, 87. Prov. 5, 14. Cf. also Job 3, 13, 23, 10 (יִתְחַנֵּן). Ruth 1, 12 (*if I should think*, &c.; comp. 2 Ki. 7, 4); in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, 1 Sam. 25, 34.—So also to express an unfulfilled desire, Num. 14, 2 לֹא מָתוּ *would that we had died . . . !* (לֹא with the imperfect would mean *would that we might die !* 1 Sam. 14, 30). Finally, also in a question indicating astonishment, Gen. 21, 7 מִי מֵלֵל *who would have said . . . ? quis dixerit ?* Ps. 73, 11.

§ 107. Use of the Imperfect¹.

The imperfect, as opposed to the perfect, represents actions, events ^a or conditions, which are regarded by the speaker at any moment as still continuing, or in process of accomplishment, or even as just taking place. In the last case, its occurrence may be represented as certainly imminent, or merely as conceived in the mind of the speaker, or simply as desired, and therefore only contingent (the modal use of the imperfect).

Knudtzon (see above, Rem. on § 106. a) would prefer the term *present* rather than imperfect, on the ground that the tense expresses what is either actually or mentally present. In any case, the essential difference between the perfect and imperfect consists, he argues, in this, that the perfect simply indicates what is actually complete, while the imperfect places the action, &c., in a more direct relation to the judgement or feeling of the speaker².

More precisely the imperfect serves—

1. In the sphere *past time* :

(a) To express actions, &c., which *continued* throughout a longer ^b or shorter period³, e.g. Gen. 2, 6 *a mist went up* continually (עָלָה), 2, 25, 37, 7, 48, 10. Ex. 1, 12, 8, 20, 13, 22, 15, 6, 12, 14, 15. Num. 9, 15 sq. 20 sq. 23, 7. Jud. 2, 1, 5, 8, 1 Sam. 3, 2, 13, 17 sq. 2 Sam. 2, 28, 23, 10, 1 Ki. 3, 4, 7, 8, 21, 6. Is. 1, 21, 6, 4 (יָסַד), 17, 10 sq. 51, 2 a. Jer. 13, 7, 36, 18. Ps. 18, 7, 14, 17 sqq. 38 sqq. 24, 2, 32, 4, 5 (אִירָעָה), 47, 5, 68, 10, 12, 104, 6 sqq. 106, 19, 107, 18, 29, 139, 13. Job 3, 3, 11, 4, 12, 15 sq. 10, 10 sq. 15, 7 sq.—

¹ Comp. the literature cited above, p. 320, note.

² This is undoubtedly the view of De Lagarde also (*Übersicht über die Bildung der Nomina*, p. 6), when he defines the perfect as serving to express that of which we are immediately sensible, the imperfect that at which we arrive by comparison and imagination.

³ Comp. the Mēša' inscription, l. 5, כִּי יֵאָנֶף בְּמַשׁ בְּאַרְצָה *for Chemosh was angry with his country*.

very frequently alternating with a perfect (especially with a frequentative perfect; cf. Num. 9, 15-23 and § 112. *e*), or when the narration is continued by means of an imperfect consecutive¹.

- c* Rem. 1. The imperfect is frequently used in this way after the particles **אָז** *then*, **עַד** *until*, e.g. Ex. 15, 1 **אָז** *then sang Moses, &c.*; Num. 21, 17. Deut. 4, 41. Jos. 10, 12. 1 Ki. 3, 16. Ps. 126, 2. Job 38, 21. (The *perfect* is used after **אָז** when stress is to be laid on the fact that the action has really taken place, and not upon its gradual accomplishment or duration in the past, e.g. Gen. 4, 26 **אָז** *then began, &c.*; Gen. 49, 4. Ex. 15, 15. Jos. 22, 31. Jud. 5, 11. Ps. 89, 20².) After **טָרָם** e.g. Gen. 19, 4 **טָרָם** *before they lay down*; Gen. 2, 5. 24, 45. 1 Sam. 3, 3-7, always in the sense of our *pluperfect*. (In Gen. 24, 15 instead of the perf. **בָּקָה**, the imperf. should be read, as in verse 45; so also in 1 Sam. 3, 7 **יָרַע** an imperf. is co-ordinated with **יָרַע**.) After **בְּטָרָם** (sometimes also simply **טָרָם** Ex. 12, 34. Jos. 3, 1), e.g. Jer. 1, 5 **בְּטָרָם** *before thou camest forth*; Gen. 27, 33. 37, 18. 41, 50. Ruth 3, 14 (perhaps also in Ps. 90, 2 an imperf. was intended instead of **יָרַד**; comp. Wellhausen on 2 Sam. 3, 2). After **עַד** Jos. 10, 13. Ps. 73, 17 (*until I went*), 2 Chron. 29, 34; on the other hand, with the perf. e.g. Jos. 2, 22³.
- d* 2. Driver (*The Use of the Tenses*, p. 32) rightly lays stress upon the inherent distinction between the *participle* as expressing *mere duration*, and the *imperfect* as expressing *progressive duration* (in the present, past, or future). Thus the words **נָהָר** *Gen. 2, 10* represent the river of Paradise as going out of Eden in a continuous, uninterrupted stream, but **יִפְרֹד**, which immediately follows, describes how the parting of its waters is always taking place afresh. In the same way **יַעֲלֶה** *Gen. 2, 6* represents new mists as constantly arising, and **יִסְלַח** *Is. 6, 4* new clouds of smoke. Also those actions, &c., which might be regarded in themselves as single or even momentary, are, as it were, broken up by the imperfect into their component parts, and so pictured as gradually completing themselves. Hence **תִּבְלַעְמוּ** *Ex. 15, 12* (after a *perf.* as in verse 14) represents the Egyptians, in a vivid, poetic description, as being swallowed up one after another, and **יִנְחֲנִי** *Num. 23, 7* the leading on by stages, &c.

¹ According to the Masora such imperfects occur in Is. 10, 13 *bis* (where, however, **אֲמַסִּיר** might also mean *I am wont to remove, &c.*), Is. 48, 3. 57, 17. Ps. 18, 38 *b*, also (according to § 49. *c*) in 2 Sam. 1, 10 and Ezek. 16, 10. In some other cases **י** is no doubt a dogmatic emendation for **י** (*imperf. consec.*) in order to represent historical statements as promises; comp. Is. 42, 6. 51, 2 *bis*, 63, 3 sqq. and the note on p. 151.

² After **אָז** *then* (to announce future events) the imperf. is naturally used in the sense of a future, Gen. 24, 41. Ex. 12, 48. Mic. 3, 4. Zeph. 3, 9. Ps. 51, 21.

³ As after **אָז**, so also after **טָרָם**, **בְּטָרָם** and **עַד** the imperf. may be used, according to the context, in the sense of our *future*, e.g. 2 Ki. 2, 9. Is. 65, 24. Job 10, 21; after **עַד** e.g. Is. 22, 14. The imperf. is used in the sense of our *present* after **טָרָם** in Ex. 9, 30. 10, 7.

(*δ*) To express actions, &c., which were *repeated* in the past, either at fixed intervals or occasionally (the *modus rei repetitæ*), e.g. Job 1, 5 *thus did* (כִּשְׁלֹמֹה) *Job continually* (after each occasion of his sons' festivities); 4, 3 sq. 22, 6 sq. 23, 11. 29, 7. 9. 12 sq. Gen. 6, 4. 29, 2. 30, 38. 42. 31, 39 (*I used to bear* the loss of it), Ex. 1, 12. 19, 19. 33, 7 sqq. (כִּשְׁלֹמֹה *used to take* every time). 40, 36 sqq. Num. 9, 17 sq. 20 sqq. 11, 5. 9. Jud. 6, 4. 14, 10. 21, 25. 1 Sam. 1, 7. 2, 22. 9, 9. 13, 19. 18, 5. 27, 9. 2 Sam. 1, 22. 12, 3. 13, 18. 1 Ki. 5, 25 (of tribute repeated year by year). 10, 5. 13, 33. 14, 28. 2 Ki. 4, 8. 8, 29. 13, 20. 25, 14. Jer. 36, 23. Ps. 42, 5. 44, 3. 78, 15. 40. 103, 7. Est. 2, 14; even in a negative dependent clause, 1 Ki. 18, 10.

2. In the sphere of *present time*, again

(*a*) To express actions, events, or conditions, which are *continued* for a shorter or longer time¹, e.g. Gen. 37, 15 מַה תִּבְקֹשׁ *what seekest thou?* 19, 19 לֹא אֶחָד I cannot; 24, 50. 31, 35. Is. 1, 13. Other examples are Gen. 2, 10. 24, 31. 1 Sam. 1, 8. 11, 5. 1 Ki. 3, 7. Ps. 2, 2. So especially to express facts known by experience, which occur at all times, and consequently hold good at any moment, e.g. Prov. 15, 20 *a wise son maketh a glad father*; hence especially frequent in Job and Proverbs. In an interrogative sentence, e.g. Job 4, 17 *is mortal man just before God?* In a negative sentence, Job 4, 18, &c.

(*δ*) To express actions, &c., which may be *repeated* at any time, *g* including therefore the present, or are *customarily* repeated on a given occasion (comp. above, letter *e*), e.g. Deut. 1, 44 *as bees do* (are accustomed to do); Gen. 6, 21. 32, 33. 43, 32. Jud. 11, 40. 1 Sam. 2, 8. 5, 5. 20, 2. 2 Sam. 15, 32. Is. 1, 23. 3, 16. Ps. 1, 3. So again (see letter *f*) especially to express facts known by experience which may at any time come into effect again, e.g. Ex. 23, 8 *a gift blindeth* (עֵינַיִם), &c.; Gen. 2, 24. 22, 14. Is. 32, 6. Am. 3, 7. Mal. 1, 6. Job 2, 4, &c. Of the same kind also is the imperfect in such relative clauses (see § 155), as Gen. 49, 27 *Benjamin is* יִצְחָק אֶבְרָתָא *a wolf that ravineth* (properly, is accustomed to ravin). Finally, compare also the formulæ יִצְחָק *it is* (wont to be) *said* (to introduce proverbial

¹ It is not always possible to carry out with certainty the distinction between *continued* and *repeated* actions. Some of the examples given under letter *f* might equally be referred to letter *g*.

expressions) Gen. 10, 9. 22, 14, and elsewhere; **לֹא-יִהְיֶה** *it is not (wont to be) so done* (and hence *may not, shall not be*, see letter *u*), Gen. 29, 26. 20, 9. 34, 7. 2 Sam. 13, 12.

h (c) To express actions, &c., which although, strictly speaking, they are already finished, are regarded as still lasting on into the present time, or continuing to operate in it, e.g. Gen. 32, 30 *wherefore is it that thou dost ask* (**וְשָׁאַלְתָּ**) *after my name?* 24, 31. 44, 7. Ex. 5, 15. 2 Sam. 16, 9. In such cases, naturally, the perfect is also admissible, and is sometimes found in the same formula as the imperfect, e.g. Job 1, 7 (2, 2) **מֵאֵן תָּבֹא** *whence comest thou (just now)?* but Gen. 16, 8 (comp. 42, 7) **מֵאֵן תָּבֹא** *whence comest thou?* The imperfect represents the coming as still in its last stage, whereas the perfect represents it as an accomplished fact.

i 3. In the sphere of *future time*. To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as about to take place, and as continuing a shorter or longer time in the future, or as being repeated; thus:

(a) From the standpoint of the speaker's present time, e.g. Ex. 4, 1 *they will not believe* (**וְלֹא-יִאֱמִינוּ**) *me, nor hearken* (**וְלֹא-יִשְׁמְעוּ**) *unto my voice: for they will say* (**וְיֹאמְרוּ**), &c., 6, 1. 9, 5, &c.

k (b) In dependent clauses to represent actions, &c., which from some point of time in the past are to be represented as future, e.g. Gen. 43, 7 *could we in any wise know that he would say* (**וְיֹאמַר**)? 2, 19. 43, 25. Ex. 2, 4. 2 Ki. 3, 27 **וְיִשְׁלַח** *qui regnaturus erat*; 13, 14. Jon. 4, 5. Job 3, 3. Eccles. 2, 3. Ps. 78, 6 *that the generation to come might know*, **וְיֵלְדוּ בְּנִים** *the children which should be born (qui nascituri essent*; the imperfect here with the collateral idea of the occurrence being repeated in the future).

l (c) To represent a *futurum exactum*; comp. Is. 4, 4. 6, 11 (co-ordinated with a perfect used in the same sense, see § 106. o); so also sometimes after the temporal particles **עַד** Ps. 132, 5 and **עַד-עַד** *until* Gen. 29, 8. Num. 20, 17, &c.

m 4. Finally to the sphere of future time belong also those cases in which the (modal) imperfect serves to express actions, events, or conditions, the occurrence of which is to be represented as willed (or not willed), or as in some way conditional, and consequently only contingent. More particularly such imperfects serve—

n (a) As an expression of will, whether it be a definite intention and arrangement, or a simple desire, viz.:

(1) Sometimes in positive sentences in place of the cohortative (comp. e. g. Ps. 59, 17 with verse 18; 2 Sam. 22, 50 with Ps. 18, 50; Jud. 19, 11, &c.), of the imperative (Is. 18, 3), or of the jussive (which, however, in most cases, does not differ from the ordinary form of the imperfect), e. g. *תֵּרָאָה* *let it appear* Gen. 1, 9. 41, 34. Lev. 19, 2. 3. 2 Sam. 10, 12 (and so frequently in verbs *לִי*; comp. § 109. a, note); Zech. 9, 5 (*תִּחִל*); Ps. 61, 7 (*תִּסִּיף*); Prov. 22, 17 (*תִּשִּׁית*); 23, 1. Job 6, 23 (co-ordinated with the imperative), 10, 20 *K'ih.*; so probably also *יִדֵּן* *let him judge!* Ps. 72, 2.—So also in the 1st pers., to express a wish which should have been subsequently accomplished at a fixed point of time in the past, e. g. Job 10, 18 *אֶמָּוֶת* *I should have* (then, immediately after being born) *given up the ghost*; comp. verse 19 *אֶחְיֶה* and *אֶבְכֶּה*. Even to express an obligation or necessity according to the judgement of another person, e. g. Job 9, 29 *אֶרְשָׁע* *I am to be guilty*; 12, 4. Comp. Job 9, 15. 19, 16; in a question, Ps. 42, 10. 43, 2.

(2) To express the definite expectation that something will not happen. The imperfect with *לֹא* represents a more emphatic form of prohibition than the jussive¹ with *אַל* (comp. § 109. c), and corresponds to our *thou shalt not do it!* with the strongest expectation of obedience, while *אַל* with the jussive is rather a simple warning, *do not that!* Thus *לֹא* with the imperfect is especially used in enforcing the divine commands, e. g. *לֹא תִגְנוֹב* *thou shalt not steal* Ex. 20, 15; comp. verses 3. 4. 5. 7. 10 sqq. So *לֹא* with the 3rd pers. perhaps in Prov. 16, 10.

Rem. The *jussive*, which is to be expected after *אַל*, does not, as a rule (according to letter *n* above, and § 109. a, note), differ in form from the simple imperfect. That many supposed jussives are intended as simple imperfects is possible from the occurrence after *אַל* of what are undoubtedly imperfect forms, not only from verbs *לִי* (comp. for these § 109. a, note), but also from verbs *עָזַר*: to express a prohibition or negative wish, *אַל תִּבְרַח* Gen. 19, 17, *אַל תִּסְדֹּר* Jos. 1, 7, *אַל תִּשָּׂא* 1 Sam. 25, 25. Even with the 1st pers. plur. (after an imperative) *אַל נִסְחָת* *that we die not* 1 Sam. 12, 19. Also to express the conviction that something cannot happen, *אַל יִנָּמ* *he will not slumber* Ps. 121, 3; comp. Jer. 46, 6. 2 Chron. 14, 10.

¹ As stated in § 46. a, a prohibition cannot be expressed by *אַל* and the imperative.

² To regard this as an optative (so Hupfeld) is from the context impossible. It is more probably a strong pregnant construction, or fusion of two sentences (such as, *do not think he will slumber!*). Verse 4 contains the objective confirmation, by means of *לֹא* with the imperf., of the conviction which was previously only subjective.

q (3) In dependent clauses after final conjunctions (§ 165. *b*), as **אֲשֶׁר**, Gen. 11, 7 (**אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ** *that they may not understand*); **בְּעֶבֶר**, Gen. 21, 30. 27, 4. 19. Ex. 9, 14, and elsewhere; **לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר** Num. 17, 5; **לִמְעַן** Deut. 4, 1. Ps. 51, 6. 78, 6, and **אֲשֶׁר יֵעָן**¹ Ez. 12, 12 *that*²; **לִבְלֹאִי** *that . . . not* Ex. 20, 20. 2 Sam. 14, 14; also after **כִּי** *that not, lest* Gen. 3, 22. 11, 4. 19, 15, and elsewhere³. In Lev. 9, 6 such an imperfect (or jussive? see the examples in § 109. *f*) is added to the expression of the command by an asyndeton, and in Lam. 1, 19 to the principal clause simply by **!**: *while they sought them food וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ אֶת־נַפְשָׁם* *to refresh their souls* (cf. also Lam. 3, 26 *it is good and let him hope*, i.e. *that he should hope*); so after an interrogative clause, Ex. 2, 7. Finally also in a relative clause, Ps. 32, 8 **בְּדֶרֶךְ־וַיְהִי תֵלֶךְ** *in the way which thou shouldst go*.

r (δ) To express actions, &c., which are to be represented as possibly taking place or not taking place (sometimes corresponding to the *potential* of the classical languages, as also to our use of the auxiliaries *can, may, should*⁴). More particularly such imperfects are used—

s (1) In a permissive sense, e.g. Gen. 2, 16 *of every tree of the garden (אֶמְלֵךְ תֹּאכַל) thou mayest freely eat* (the contrary in verse 17); 3, 2. 42, 37. Lev. 21, 3. 22. Job 21, 3. In the 1st pers. Ps. 5, 8. 22, 18 (*I may, or can, tell*); in a negative sentence, e.g. Ps. 5, 5.

t (2) In interrogative sentences, e.g. Prov. 20, 9 **מִי־יֹאמַר** *quis dixerit?* Comp. Gen. 17, 17. 18, 14. 31, 43. 1 Sam. 11, 12. 2 Ki. 5, 12 **הֲלֹא־אֶרְחֹץ בָּהֶם** *may I not wash in them?* Is. 33, 14. Ps. 15, 1. 24, 3. Eccles. 5, 5. So especially in a question expressing surprise after **אֵיךְ**, e.g. Gen. 39, 9 *how then can I . . . ?* 44, 34. Is. 19, 11. Ps. 137, 4, and even with regard to some point of time in the past, looking forward from which an event might have been expected to take

¹ But **אֲשֶׁר יֵעָן** in a causal sense (*because, since*), e.g. Jud. 2, 20 (as **אֲשֶׁר** Gen. 34, 27) is followed by the perfect. On Jos. 4, 24 see above, § 74. *g*.

[² R.V. *because he shall not see*.]

³ 2 Ki. 2, 16 **כִּי־יֵרָא** occurs with the perf. in a vivid presentment of the time, when the fear is realized and the remedy comes too late. (In 2 Sam. 20, 6, since a *perfect consec.* follows, read with Driver **יֵרָא**.)

⁴ By this, of course, is not meant that these finer distinctions were consciously present to the Hebrew mind. They are rather mere expedients for making intelligible to ourselves the full significance of the Semitic imperfect.

place, e.g. Gen. 43, 7 וְהִידוע נָרַע *could we in any wise know . . . ?* Comp. 2 Sam. 3, 33 (יָמוּת) *was Abner to die as a fool*, i.e. *was he destined to die . . . ?*), and so probably also Gen. 34, 31 (*should he deal . . . ?*). Very closely connected with this is the use of the imperfect—

(3) In a consecutive clause depending on an interrogative clause, ^u e.g. Ex. 3, 11 *who am I* (מִי אֲנִי) *that I should (ought, could) go ?* 16, 7. Num. 11, 12. Jud. 9, 28. 1 Sam. 18, 18. 2 Ki. 8, 13. Is. 29, 16. Job 6, 11. 21, 15, similarly after אֵלֶּךְ Gen. 38, 18. Ex. 5, 2.

Rem. In such passages as 1 Sam. 11, 5. Ps. 8, 5. 114, 5, the context shows that ^v the imperfect corresponds rather to our present. In such sentences the perfect also is naturally used in referring to completed actions, e.g. Gen. 20, 10. Jud. 18, 23. 2 Sam. 7, 18. Is. 22, 1.

(4) In *negative sentences* to express actions, &c., which cannot or ^w should not happen, e.g. Gen. 32, 13 אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִסְפָּר מִרְבּוֹ *which cannot be numbered for multitude*; 20, 9 *deeds* (אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה) *that ought not to be done* (comp. above, letter g); Ps. 5, 5.

(5) In *conditional clauses* (the *modus conditionalis* corresponding ^x to the Latin present or imperfect conjunctive) both in the protasis and apodosis, or only in the latter, Ps. 23, 4 וְלֹא אֵימָא יָרֵעַ . . . יָם קִרְיָאֵךְ *yea, though I walk (or had to walk) . . . I fear (or I would fear) no evil*; Job 9, 20 *though I be righteous, mine own mouth shall condemn me*. After a perfect in the protasis, e.g. Job 23, 10. Very frequently also in an apodosis, the protasis to which must be supplied from the context, e.g. Job 5, 8 *but as for me, I would seek unto God* (were I in thy place); 3, 13. 16. 14, 14 sq. Ps. 55, 13. Ruth 1, 12. However, some of the imperfects in these examples are probably intended as jussive forms. Comp. § 109. h.

§ 108. Use of the Cohortative.

The cohortative, i.e. according to § 48. c, the 1st pers.¹ sing. or ^a plur. of the imperfect lengthened by the ending וּלְ², represents in general an endeavour directed expressly towards a definite object. While the corresponding forms of the indicative rather contain the mere announcement that an action will be undertaken, the cohortative

¹ For the few examples of cohortatives in the 3rd sing., see § 48. d.

² But verbs לָל, according to § 75. l, even in the cohortative, almost always have the ending וּלְ; comp. e.g. in Deut. 32, 20 אֲמַרְיָה after אֲמַרְיָה.

lays stress on the determination underlying the action, and the personal interest in it.

Its uses may be divided into—

- b* 1. The cohortative, whether standing alone or co-ordinated with another cohortative, and frequently strengthened by the addition of the particle **נָּ**:

(*a*) To express self-encouragement, e.g. Ex. 3, 3 **וְנִסְתָּהּ נָּ** *I will turn aside now, and see . . . !* So especially as the result of inward deliberation (in soliloquies), e.g. Gen. 18, 21. 32, 21 (rarely so used after **לֹא**, Gen. 21, 16 *let me not look . . . !* Jer. 18, 18), and also as a more or less emphatic statement of a fixed determination, e.g. Is. 5, 1 *I will sing*¹. . . / 5, 6. 31, 8. Comp. also Gen. 46, 30 *now let me die (I am willing to die), since I have seen thy face*; and Ps. 31, 8. In the 1st pers. plur. the cohortative includes a summons to others to help in doing something, e.g. Ps. 2, 3 **נִבְחֶשֶׁה** *come! let us break asunder!* &c., and Gen. 11, 3.

- c* (*b*) To express a wish, or a request for permission, that one should be allowed to do something, e.g. Deut. 2, 27 **אֶעְבְּרָה** *may I be allowed to pass through (let me pass through)!* Num. 20, 17 **נִעְבְּרָה נָּ** *may we be allowed to pass through!* Jer. 40, 15 *let me go, I pray thee!* &c.; 2 Sam. 16, 9; so after **לֹא** 2 Sam. 24, 14. Jer. 17, 18. Ps. 25, 2, &c., 69, 15. After **אֵלַי** Jon. 1, 14.

- d* 2. The cohortative in dependence on other moods, as well as in conditional sentences: (*a*) In dependence (with *wāw* copulative, Ps. 9, 15 after **לִסְעֹן**) on an imperative or jussive to express an intention or intended consequence, e.g. Gen. 27, 4 *bring it to me, וְאֹכְלָה that I may eat, prop. then will I eat*; Gen. 19, 5. 23, 4. 24, 56. 27, 25. 29, 21. 30, 25 sq. 42, 34. 49, 1. Deut. 32, 1. Hos. 6, 1. Ps. 2, 8. 39, 14. Job 10, 20 *Q*re*; Is. 5, 19 *and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come, וְנִדְעָה that we may know it!* Gen. 26, 28. 1 Sam. 27, 5. Also after negative sentences, Gen. 18, 30. 32. Jud. 6, 39, and after interrogative sentences, 1 Ki. 22, 7. Is. 40, 25. 41, 26. Am. 8, 5.

- e* (*b*) In conditional sentences (with or without **אִם**) to express a contingent intention, e.g. Job 16, 6 **אִם-אֶדְבָּרָה** *should I determine to speak, my grief is not assuaged, וְאִחְדִּילָה and should I forbear, what am I eased?*

[¹ R.V. *let me sing*.]

without **אִם** Job 19, 18. 30, 26 (where, however, **וְאִיחָלָה** is probably intended); Ps. 73, 16 (unless **וְאִחָה** should be read), 139, 8 sq. After the 3rd person, Job 11, 17 *though it be dark*, &c. So perhaps also 2 Sam. 22, 38 **אִרְדָּפָה** *if I determined to pursue*, then . . . , comp., however, Ps. 18, 38.

(c) Likewise in the apodosis of conditional sentences, e.g. Job *f* 31, 7 sq. *if my step hath turned out of the way* . . . , **וְאִרְעָה** *then let me sow*; comp. 16, 4 sq. *I also could speak as ye do, if* . . . ! So even when the condition must be supplied from the context, e.g. Ps. 40, 6 *else would I declare and speak of them*; 51, 18 *else would I (gladly) give it*, i.e. if thou didst require it (comp. the precisely similar **וְאִשָּׂא** Ps. 55, 13); Job 6, 10. In the 1st plur. Jer. 20, 10. To the same category belong the cohortatives after the formula expressing a wish **מִרְיָתִי, מִרְיָתִי**, e.g. Jer. 9, 1 *oh, that I had* . . . , **וְאִשְׁעָבָה** *then* (i.e. if I had) *should I (or would I) leave my people*, &c.; Jud. 9, 29. Job 6, 8 sqq., without *Wāw* Is. 27, 4. Ps. 55, 7. Job 23, 4 (comp. also verse 7).

Rem. 1. The question, whether a resolution formed under compulsion (a *necessity*) *g* is also expressed by the cohortative (so, according to the prevailing opinion, Is. 38, 10 **אֶלְכָּה**; Jer. 3, 25. 4, 19. 21. 6, 10. Ps. 55, 3. 18 (!); 57, 5, where, however, with Hupfeld, **שִׁכְבָּה** should be read; 77, 7. 88, 16, and in the 1st plur. Is. 59, 10), is to be answered in the sense that in these examples the cohortative *form* is used after its meaning has become entirely lost, merely for the sake of its fuller sound, instead of the ordinary imperfect. This view is strongly supported by the rather numerous examples of cohortative forms after *wāw* consec. of the imperfect (comp. § 49. e, as also Ps. 66, 6 **נִשְׂמְחָה** *there did we rejoice*¹; Ps. 119, 163 **וְאִתְעַבָּה**; Prov. 7, 7), which can likewise only be explained as forms chosen merely for euphony, and therefore due to considerations of rhythm.

2. The cohortative is strange after **עַד** Ps. 73, 17 *until I went* . . . , **אֶבְיֶנָּה** *h* *I considered their latter end*; possibly a pregnant construction for ‘until I made up my mind, saying, I will consider,’ &c. (but **אֶבְיֶנָּה** Prov. 7, 7 is still dependent on the preceding !); **עַד־אֶרְיָעָה** Prov. 12, 19 is at any rate to be explained in the same way (for which in Jer. 49, 19. 50, 44 we have **עַד־אֶרְיָא** with a similar meaning), *as long as I (intentionally) wink with the eye-lashes (shall wink)*. On the other hand, in Ex. 32, 30 **אֶכְפֹּר**, with the Samaritan, is to be read instead of **אֶכְפֹּרָה** after **אֶלְכָּה**.

¹ Analogous to this cohortative (as equivalent to the imperfect) after **שָׁמַע** is the use of the historic imperf. after **אֶלְכָּה**, § 107. c.

§ 109. Use of the Jussive.

- a* As the *cohortative* is used in the 1st pers., so the *jussive* (comp. for its form, which frequently coincides with that of the ordinary *imperfect*¹, § 48. *f, g*) is especially found in the 2nd and 3rd pers. sing. and plur. to express a more or less definite desire that something should or should not happen. More particularly its uses may be distinguished as follows:

1. The *jussive*, either standing alone or co-ordinated with another jussive:

- b* (a) In affirmative sentences to express a command, a wish (or a blessing), advice, or a request; in the last case (the optative or precative) it is frequently strengthened by the addition of נָא. Examples: Gen. 1, 3 יְהִי אֹרֶךְ *let there be light!* Gen. 1, 6. 9. 11. &c. (the creative commands); Num. 6, 26 *the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace!* comp. verse 25. After particles expressing a wish, Gen. 30, 34 לֵי יְהִי *I would it might be*; Ps. 81, 9 אִם תִּשְׁמָעֵלִי *if thou wouldst hearken unto me!* As a humble request, Gen. 44, 33 . . . וְהָעֶרְיָל . . . יֵשֶׁב־נָא עִבְדְּךָ *let thy servant, I pray thee, abide, &c., and let the lad go up, &c.*, Gen. 47, 4.

- c* (b) In negative sentences to express prohibition or dissuasion, warning, a negative wish (or imprecation), and requests. As the prohibitive particle, אַל is used almost exclusively (according to § 107. o) before the jussive (in negative desires and requests frequently אַל-נָא); e.g. Ex. 34, 3 אִישׁ אַל-יֵרָא *neither let any man be seen!* Prov. 3, 7 *be not (אַל-תְּחַי) wise in thine own eyes!* Job 15, 31 אַל-תִּצְחַן *ne confidat.* In the form of a request (prayer), Deut. 9, 26 אַל-תִּשְׁחַת *destroy not!* 1 Ki. 2, 20. Ps. 27, 9. 69, 18.

- d* Rem. 1. The few examples of לֵא with the jussive could at most have arisen from the attempt to moderate subsequently by means of the jussive (voluntative) form what was at first intended to be a strict command (לֵא with imperf. indic.); probably, however, they are either cases in which the defective writing has been misunderstood

¹ With regard to verbs לֵא, it is true that the full form of the imperfect is frequently used with the meaning of the jussive (as also for the cohortative, see § 108. a, note 2), e.g. אַל-יֵרָא Job 3, 9 (but previously יֵצֵא *let it look for!*): especially in (Neh. 2, 3) and immediately before the principal pause, Gen. 1, 9 יֵרָא; Jud. 6, 39 יֵהִי, but previously יֵהִי נָא; Is. 47, 3 תִּרָא, previously תִּגָּל; Ps. 109, 7. On the attempt to distinguish such jussives from the imperfect by means of a special ending הֵא, see § 75. *hh*.

(as in 1 Ki. 2, 6. Ezek. 48, 14), or (as in Gen. 24, 8) instances of the purely rhythmical jussive form treated below, letter *k*. Moreover, cf. יִסְקֶה לֹא Joel 2, 2 and from the same verb Gen. 4, 12 (unless it is to be referred to letter *k*) and Deut. 13, 1. The same form, however, appears also to stand three times for the cohortative (see below), and in Num. 22, 19 for the ordinary imperfect (see, however, below, letter *z*). Thus it is doubtful whether an imaginary by-form of the ordinary imperf. is not intended by the Masora in all these cases, and whether consequently יִסְקֶה, &c. should not be restored.—On עִינֶיךָ לֹא-תִחַחֵם, &c., Deut. 7, 16. 13, 9, &c. Ezek. 5, 11, &c. cf. § 72. *r*, according to which תִּחַחֵם should probably be read in every case.—The jussive appears in the place of the cohortative after לֹא 1 Sam. 14, 36 (לֹא-נִשְׁמָרָה) co-ordinated with two cohortatives), 2 Sam. 17, 12; comp. Is. 41, 23 *K^h*. (וְנָרָא, i. e. וְנִרְאָה, after another cohortative); also (see above) לֹא אֶסְקֶה Deut. 18, 16. Hos. 9, 15, and even without לֹא Ezek. 5, 16.

2. לֹא- with the jussive (or imperf., comp. § 107. *p*) is used sometimes to express the conviction that something cannot or may not happen; comp. Is. 2, 9 וְלֹא-תִשְׁכַּח לָהֶם וְלֹא-תִשְׁכַּח לָהֶם *and thou canst not possibly forgive them* [R.V. *therefore forgive them not*]; Ps. 34, 6. 41, 3. 50, 3. 121, 3 (וְלֹא-יִתֵּן); Prov. 3, 25. Job 5, 22 וְלֹא-תִירָא *neither needest thou be afraid*; 20, 17. 40, 32.

2. The jussive when depending on other moods, or in conditional *f* sentences:

(a) Depending¹ (with *Wāw*) on an imperative or cohortative to express an intention or, an assurance of a contingent occurrence, e. g. Gen. 24, 51 *take her and go, and let her be* (וְהָיָה prop. *and she will be*) . . . ; 30, 3. 31, 37. 38, 24. Ex. 8, 4. 9, 13. 10, 17. 14, 2. Jos. 4, 16. Jud. 6, 30. 1 Sam. 5, 11. 7, 3. 1 Ki. 21, 10. Ps. 144, 5. Prov. 20, 22. Also after interrogative sentences, which include a demand, Est. 7, 2 (say) *what is thy desire* . . . , וְהָיָה (i. e. in order that) *it shall be granted*! 1 Ki. 22, 20. Is. 19, 12. Job 38, 34 sq. Depending on a cohortative, e. g. Gen. 19, 20 אֶסְלַחָה נָא לְפָנֶיךָ *oh, let me escape thither* . . . (וְהָיָה נַפְשִׁי) *that my soul may live*; even after a simple imperf. (comp. below, letter *g*), 1 Ki. 13, 33 *whosoever would, he consecrated him* . . . וְהָיָה *that he might be a priest* (read בָּהֶן) *of the high places*, but probably the LXX reading וְהָיָה is to be preferred.

Rem. In 2 Chron. 35, 21 a negative final clause with וְלֹא- is dependent on an imperative, *forbear from* (meddling with) *God . . . that he destroy thee not*. As a rule, however, negative clauses are attached to the principal sentence by means of וְלֹא and a following imperfect; so after an imperative, Gen. 42, 2. 1 Ki. 18, 44; after a jussive, Ex. 30, 20. Neh. 6, 9; after a perfect consec., Ex. 28, 35. 43. Num. 18, 5; after לֹא with an imperfect, Num. 18, 3. Deut. 17, 17

¹ This does not include the cases in which the jussive is not logically dependent on a preceding imperat., but is merely co-ordinated, e. g. Gen. 20, 7. Ps. 27, 14, &c.

neither shall he multiply wives unto himself (וְלֹא יִסְדֹּר לְכָבוֹ) that his heart turn not away; 1 Sam. 20, 14. 2 Sam. 21, 17. Jer. 11, 21; after וְלֹא with jussive, Lev. 10, 9. 16, 2. 2 Sam. 13, 25. Jer. 25, 6. 37, 20. 38, 24 sq. Even after a simple imperfect, Jer. 10, 4 with וְלֹא יִסְדֹּר . . . they fasten it (וְלֹא יִסְדֹּר) that it move not; after a participle, Job 9, 7.

- h (b) Frequently in conditional sentences (as in Arabic), either in the protasis or in the apodosis, comp. Ps. 45, 12 יִתְאֲוֶה should he desire . . . then . . . ; 104, 20 וְיָהִי . . . תְּהִי if thou makest darkness, then it is night; so also in the protasis, Ex. 22, 4. Lev. 15, 24. Is. 41, 28. Ezek. 14, 7 (וְיָצֵל). Job 34, 29; in the apodosis, Ex. 7, 9 then will it (not, then shall it) become a serpent; Job 10, 16. 13, 5. 22, 28. In a negative apodosis, Gen. 4, 12 לֹא-תִחַסֵּף, but see above, letter g). In 2 Ki. 6, 27 אֶל-וַיִּשְׁעָהּ (if the Lord do not help thee, &c.) is to be explained as a jussive in a negative protasis.

- i Rem. Undoubtedly this use of the jussive (in conditional sentences) is based on its original *voluntative* meaning; let something be so and so, then this or that must happen as a consequence. Certain other examples of the *jussive*, however, show that in the consciousness of the language the *voluntative* has in such cases become weakened almost to a *potential* mood, and hence the *jussive* serves to express facts which may happen *contingently*, or may be expected, e.g. Num. 22, 19 מִתְּחִלָּה comp., however, above, letter d); Job 9, 33 there is no daysman betwixt us, that might lay (וְיָשֹׁת, hence plainly a *subjunctive* = *qui ponat*; also in Num. 23, 19 וְיִכָּבֵד that he should lie is probably intended as a jussive); Eccles. 5, 14; so after interrogative sentences, Jer. 9, 11 who is the wise man, וְיִבֵּן qui intelligat hoc.

- k Moreover, in not a few cases, the jussive is used, without any collateral sense, for the ordinary imperfect form, and this occurs not alone in those forms, which may arise from a misunderstanding of the defective writing, as Deut. 28, 21. 36. 32, 8. 1 Ki. 8, 1. Is. 12, 1. Mic. 3, 4. 5, 8. Ps. 11, 6. 18, 12. 25, 9. 47, 4. 72, 13. 90, 3. 91, 4. 107, 29. Prov. 15, 25. Job 13, 27. 15, 33. 18, 9. 20, 23 b. 27, 22. 33, 11. 27. 36, 14. 38, 24. Eccles. 12, 6 (verse 7 יִשָּׁב, but immediately afterwards וְיָשִׁיב); Dan. 8, 12, but also in shortened forms, such as וְיִי Gen. 49, 17. Deut. 28, 8. 1 Sam. 10, 5. 2 Sam. 5, 24. Hos. 6, 1. 11, 4. Am. 5, 14. Zeph. 2, 13. Zech. 9, 5. Ps. 72, 16 sq. 104, 31. Job 18, 12. 20, 23. 26. 28. 27, 8. 33, 21. 34, 37. Ruth 3, 4. This use of the jussive can hardly be due merely to poetic license, but is rather to be explained on rhythmical grounds. In all the above-cited examples, namely, the jussive stands at the beginning of the sentence (and hence removed as far as possible from the principal tone), in others it is immediately before the principal pause (Is. 42, 6. 50, 2. Ps. 68, 15. Prov. 23, 25. Job 24, 14. 29, 3. 40, 19), or actually *in* pause (Deut. 32, 18. Job 23, 9. 11. Lam. 3, 50), and is then a simply rhythmical shortening due to the strong influence of the tone. Moreover, since the jussive in numerous cases is not distinguished in form from the imperfect (§ 48. g), it is frequently doubtful which of the two the writer intended. This especially applies to those cases, in which a *subjunctive* is to be expressed by one or other of the forms (comp. § 107. k and m-x).

§ 110. The Imperative.

1. The imperative¹, which, according to § 46, is restricted to the 2nd pers. sing. and plur., and to *positive* commands, &c., may stand either alone, or in simple co-ordination (as in 1 Ki. 18, 44. Is. 56, 1. 65, 18) with other imperatives:

(a) To express real commands, e.g. Gen. 12, 1 *get thee out of thy country*; or (like the jussive) mere admonitions (Hos. 10, 12) and requests, 2 Ki. 5, 22. Is. 5, 3; on the addition of נִּי see the Rem. The imperative is used in the sense of an ironical request (often including a threat) in 1 Ki. 2, 22 *ask for him the kingdom also*; 22, 15. Jud. 10, 14. Is. 47, 12 (with נִּי). Jer. 7, 21. Ezek. 20, 39. Am. 4, 4. Job 38, 3 sq. 40, 10 sqq. Lam. 4, 21. The imperative has a concessive sense in Nah. 3, 15 (though thou *make thyself many*, &c.), and in the cases discussed under letter *f*, e.g. Is. 8, 9 sq. 29, 9.

(b) To express permission, e.g. 2 Sam. 18, 23 after previous dissuasion, (then) *run* (for my sake)! Is. 21, 12. 45, 11.

(c) To express a distinct assurance (like our expression, *thou shalt have it*)² or promise, e.g. Is. 65, 18 *but be ye glad*, &c. (i.e. ye will have continually occasion to be glad); and Is. 37, 30. Ps. 110, 2; in a threat, Jer. 2, 19. So especially in commands, the fulfilment of which is altogether out of the power of the person addressed, e.g. Is. 54, 14 *be far from anxiety* (meaning, thou needst not fear any more); Gen. 1, 28 and elsewhere: (for other examples, such as 1 Ki. 22, 12. 2 Ki. 5, 13, see below, letter *f*). Most clearly in the case of the imperative *Niph'al* with a passive meaning, e.g. Gen. 42, 16 $\text{וְאַתֶּם הֶאֱסָרֶתֶם}$ and ye shall be bound; Deut. 32, 50. Is. 49, 9 (Is. 45, 22, see below, letter *f*).

Rem. 1. The particle נִי *age!* (§ 105) is frequently added to the imperative, as to the jussive, sometimes to soften down a command, or to make a request in a more courteous form (see above, letter *a*), Gen. 12, 13. 24, 2, sometimes to strengthen an exhortation uttered as a rebuke or threat (Num. 16, 26. 20, 10) or in ridicule (Is. 47, 12).

2. The imperative after the desiderative particle וְ Gen. 23, 13 (at the end of

¹ On the close relation between the imperative and jussive (both in meaning and form), comp. § 46 and § 48 *i*.

² Analogous to these assurances in the form of an imperative are the threatening formulae in the Latin comic writers, e.g. *vapula*, Ter. Phorm. v. 6, 10 = *vapulare te inibo*, Plaut. Curc. vi. 4, 12.

verses 5 and 14 also read *לֵךְ* for *לֵךְ* and join it to the following imperative) is due to an anacoluthon. Instead of the imperfect which would be expected here after *לֵךְ* the more forcible imperative is used in a new sentence.

- f* 2. The imperative in logical dependence upon a preceding imperative, jussive (or cohortative), or interrogative sentence, serves to express the distinct assurance or promise that an action or condition will take place as the certain consequence of a previous action. So especially:

(a) The imperative when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon another imperative. In this case the first imperative contains, as a rule, a condition, while the second declares the consequence which the fulfilment of the condition will involve. The imperative is used for this declaration, since the consequence is, as a matter of fact, intended or desired by the speaker (comp. *divide et impera*), e.g. Gen. 42, 18 *וְהָיָה עִשְׂי וְחַיִּי זאת עֲשִׂי וְחַיִּי* *this do, and live*, i.e. thus shall ye continue to live. 1 Ki. 22, 12. 2 Ki. 5, 13. Is. 36, 16. 45, 22 (*וְהָיָה עִשְׂי*). Jer. 6, 16. Am. 5, 4. 6. Ps. 37, 27. Prov. 3, 3 sq. 4, 4. 7, 2. 13, 20 *K'eh.*, Job 2, 9. 2 Chron. 20, 20; in Jer. 25, 5. Job 22, 21 *וְהָיָה* is added to the first imperative. In other cases, the first imperative contains a mocking concession, the second an irrevocable denunciation, e.g. Is. 8, 9 *וְהָיָה רָעוּ עַמִּים רָעוּ עַמִּים* (continue to) *make an uproar, O ye peoples, and ye shall be broken in pieces*; comp. verse 9 *b*.

- g* Rem. 1. If a promise or threat dependent on an imperative be expressed in the 3rd pers. then the jussive is naturally used instead of the 2nd imperative Is. 8, 10. 55, 2.

h 2. In Prov. 20, 13 the second imperative (containing a promise) is attached by asyndeton; elsewhere two imperatives occur side by side without the copula, where the second might be expected to be subordinated to the first, e.g. Deut. 2, 24 *וְהָיָה לְךָ חֵלֶק* (where *וְהָיָה* is virtually, as it were, an object to *חֵלֶק*) *begin, take in possession for to take in possession* (comp., however, Jud. 19, 6 *וְהָיָה לְךָ חֵלֶק* *be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night*, and for this kind of co-ordination in general, comp. § 120. *d*). But such imperatives as *וְהָיָה לְךָ חֵלֶק* (קִיֵּם, לְךָ), when immediately preceding a second imperative, are for the most part only equivalent to interjections, *come! up!*

- i* (b) The imperative, when depending (with *wāw copulative*) upon a jussive (cohortative), or an interrogative sentence, expresses also frequently a consequence which is to be expected with certainty, and often a consequence which is intended, or in fact an intention; comp. Gen. 20, 7 *and he shall pray for thee, וְהָיָה וְתָחַי* *and thou shalt live*; comp. Ex. 14, 13. 16. 2 Ki. 5, 10. Job 11, 6. Ps. 128, 5 *the Lord bless thee . . . so that (or in order that) thou seest, &c.*; Ruth 1, 9.

4, 11; after a cohortative, Gen. 12, 2. 45, 18. Ex. 3, 10 הוֹצֵא that thou mayest bring forth; Ex. 18, 22. 1 Sam. 12, 17. 1 Ki. 1, 12; Jer. 35, 15 (after imperative and jussive); after an interrogative sentence, 2 Sam. 21, 3 *wherewith shall I make atonement*, וְהִכְרִיתִי that ye may bless, &c.—In Num. 5, 19 the imperative without ו (in 32, 23 with ו) is used after a conditional clause in the sense of a definite promise.

Rem. The 2nd *sing. masc.* occurs in Jud. 4, 20 (עָלֶיךָ, according to Qimhi an infinitive, in which case, however, the infinitive absolute עָלֶיךָ should be read), Mic. 1, 13 and Zech. 13, 7 (after עָלֶיךָ) in addressing feminine persons; and in Is. 23, 1. 32, 11 the 2nd *plur. masc.* Moreover, in the latter place there follow quite abnormally four imperatives of the 2nd *sing. masc.* lengthened by הָ. These can only be explained on the ground that the sharp commands, following closely upon one another, remain in the most obvious form (viz. the 2nd *sing. masc.* imperative), without any attention being paid to the gender or number of those addressed. In Nah. 3, 15 the interchange of *masc.* and *fem.* serves to express totality (the nation in all its aspects). Comp., moreover, § 145. *p* on other noticeable attempts to substitute the corresponding masculine forms for the feminine.

§ 111. *The Imperfect with Wāw Consecutive.*

1. The *imperfect with wāw consecutive* (§ 49. *a-g*) serves to express *a* actions, events, or conditions, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or conditions mentioned immediately¹ before. The *imperfect consecutive* is used in this way most frequently as the *narrative tense*, corresponding to the Greek *aorist* or the Latin *historic perfect*. As a rule the narrative is introduced by a perfect, and then continued by means of imperfects with *wāw consecutive* (comp. for this interchange of tenses § 49. *a*, and especially § 112. *a*), e. g. Gen. 3, 1 *now the serpent was* (הָיָה) *more subtil . . . and he said* (אָמַר) *unto the woman*; 4, 1. 6, 9 sqq. 10, 9 sq. 15. 19. 11, 12 sqq. 27 sqq. 14, 5 sq. 15, 1 sq. 16, 1 sq. 21, 1 sqq. 24, 1 sq. 25, 19 sqq. 36, 2 sqq. 37, 2.

Rem. 1. To this class belong some of the numerous *imperfects consec.* after various expressions of time, whenever such expressions are equivalent in meaning to a perfect² (viz. הָיָה *it came to pass*), e. g. Is. 6, 1 *in the year that king Uzziah*

¹ On an apparent exception (the *imperf. consec.* at the beginning of whole Books) see § 49. *b* note.

² Comp. Is. 45, 4, where the *imperf. consec.* is joined to an abrupt statement of the cause, and Job 36, 7, where it is joined to an abrupt statement of the place.

died, I saw (וַיֵּרָא), &c.; Gen. 22, 4. 27, 34. Jud. 11, 16. 1 Sam. 4, 19. 17, 57. 21, 6. Hos. 11, 1: on the use of וַיֵּרָא to connect expressions of time, see below, letter *g*.— It is only in late books or passages that we find the simple *perfect* in a clause following an expression of time, as 1 Sam. 17, 55 (cf. Driver on the passage). 2 Chron. 12, 7. 15, 8, &c. Dan. 10, 11. 15, 19; the *Perfect* after וַיֵּרָא and the subject, 2 Chron. 7, 1.

c 2. The continuation of the narrative by means of the imperfect consec. may result in a series of such imperfects as long as may be desired, e.g. there are forty-nine in Gen. 1. As soon, however, as the connecting *Wāw* becomes separated from the verb to which it belongs, by the insertion of any word, the perfect necessarily takes the place of the imperfect, e.g. Gen. 1, 5 and God called (וַיִּקְרָא) the light Day, and the darkness he called (וַיִּקְרָא) Night; verse 10. 2, 20. 11, 3 and frequently.

d 3. Of two co-ordinate imperfects consecutive the former (as equivalent to a temporal clause) is most frequently subordinate in sense to the latter, e.g. Gen. 28, 8 sq. וַיֵּרָא . . . וַיֵּרָא when Esau saw that . . . , he went, &c.; so also, frequently וַיֵּרָא, &c., Gen. 37, 21 and elsewhere. On the other hand, a second imperfect consecutive is seldom used in an explanatory sense, e.g. Ex. 2, 10 (וַיִּשָּׁרַח for she said); comp. 1 Sam. 7, 12. Other examples of the imperfect consecutive, which apparently represent a progress in the narrative, in reality only refer to the same time, or explain what precedes, see Gen. 2, 25 (וַיִּהְיֶה they were; but Jos. 4, 9. 1 Ki. 8, 8 they are); 36, 14 (וַיִּהְיֶה). 32 (וַיִּהְיֶה). 1 Ki. 1, 44.

e 4. The imperfect consecutive sometimes has such a merely external connexion with an immediately preceding perfect, that in reality it represents an antithesis to it, e.g. Gen. 32, 31 and (yet) my life is preserved; 2 Sam. 3, 8 and yet thou chargest me; Job 10, 8. 32, 3; similarly in dependence on noun-clauses, Prov. 30, 25 sqq.

f 2. The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section of the narrative, by means of an imperfect consecutive, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously. Such a connexion is especially often established by means of וַיֵּרָא (καὶ ἐγένετο) and it came to pass, after which there then follows either an imperfect consecutive (Gen. 4, 3. 8. 6. 11, 2. Ex. 12, 29. 13, 17, &c.), or *Wāw* with the perfect (separated from it), Gen. 7, 10. 15, 12. 22, 1. 27, 30, or even a perfect without *Wāw* (Gen. 8, 13. 14, 1 sq. 40, 1. Ex. 12, 41. 16, 22. Num. 10, 11. Deut. 1, 3. 1 Sam. 18, 30. 2 Ki. 8, 21, &c.), or finally a noun-clause introduced by *Wāw*, Gen. 41, 1.

g Rem. 1. This loose connexion by means of וַיֵּרָא is especially common, when the narrative or a new section of it begins with any expression of time, see above, letter *b*; comp., in addition to the above-mentioned examples (e.g. Gen. 22, 1 and it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham), the similar cases in Gen. 19, 34. 21, 22. 1 Sam. 11, 11. Ruth 1, 1. Elsewhere the statement

of time is expressed by כִּי or וְכִי with an infinitive (Gen. 12, 14, 19, 17, 29, 39, 13, 15, 18 sq. Jud. 16, 25) or by an independent sentence with the perfect (equivalent to a pluperfect, comp. § 106. f), e.g. Gen. 15, 17, 24, 15, 27, 30, or by a temporal clause introduced by כִּי when, Gen. 26, 8, 27, 1. Jud. 16, 16, כִּי הָיָה when, Gen. 12, 11, 20, 13, $\text{מִזֶּמֶן מִן הַיָּמִים}$ from the time that, Gen. 39, 5; or, finally, by a noun-clause (comp. § 116. u), e.g. 2 Ki. 13, 21 $\text{וַיְהִי הֵם לְקָבְרִים אִשִּׁשׁ}$ and it came to pass, as they were (just) burying a man (prop. they burying), that . . . ; Gen. 42, 35, 2 Ki. 2, 11 (the apodosis in both these cases being introduced by וַהֲיָה); 1 Sam. 7, 10, 2 Sam. 13, 30, 2 Ki. 6, 5, 26, 19, 37 (= Is. 37, 38).—In 1 Sam. 10, 11, 11, 11, 2 Sam. 2, 23, 15, 2 a noun standing absolutely follows וַיְהִי (as the equivalent of a complete sentence; see below, letter *h*), and then an *imperfect consecutive* follows.

2. Closely related to the cases noticed in letter *g* are those in which the *imperfect consecutive*, even without a preceding וְיִי, introduces the apodosis either—
 (a) to whole sentences, or (b) to what are equivalent to whole sentences, especially to nouns standing absolutely. As in certain cases of the *perfect consecutive* (see § 112. x), so the *imperfect consecutive* has here acquired a sort of independent force. Comp. for (a) 1 Sam. 15, 23 *because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, וְיִימָאֵל he hath rejected thee* (comp. Num. 14, 16. Is. 48, 4, where the causal clause precedes in the form of an infinitive with preposition), Ex. 9, 21; for (b) Gen. 22, 24 וְיִימָאֵל and (as to) *his concubine* . . . , וְיִימָאֵל *she bare*, &c.; Ex. 38, 24. Num. 14, 36 sq. 1 Sam. 14, 19. 17, 24. 2 Sam. 4, 10. 19, 41 *Kth*. 21, 16. 1 Ki. 9, 20 sq. 12, 17. 2 Ki. 25, 22. Jer. 6, 19. 28, 8. 33, 24. 44, 25'.—In 1 Ki. 15, 13. 2 Ki. 16, 14 the preceding noun, used absolutely, is regarded as the object of the following imperfect consecutive, and is therefore introduced by וְיִי.

8. The *imperfect consecutive* serves, in the cases treated under *i* letters *a-h*, to represent either expressly, or at least to a great extent, a *chronological* succession of actions or events; elsewhere it expresses those actions, &c., which represent the logical consequence of what preceded, or a result arising from it by an inherent necessity. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* is used—

(a) As a final summing up of the preceding narrative, e.g. Gen. 2, 1. *k* 23, 20 **וְכֵן הָיָה** *so* (in this way) *the field became* (legally) *the property of Abraham, &c.*; 1 Sam. 17, 50. 31, 6.

(δ) To express a logical or necessary consequence of that which immediately precedes, e.g. Gen. 39, 2. Job 2, 3 *and he still holdeth fast his integrity*, וְאִמְרָתוֹ *so that thou thus* (as it now appears)

¹ Comp. the *Mēša* inscription, l. 5 (*Omri*) *the king of Israel, וְיָמֵי* *who oppressed Moab, &c.*—The peculiar imperfect consecutive in Gen. 30, 27 *b* (in the earlier editions explained as equivalent to an object-clause) arises rather from a pregnant brevity of expression: *I have observed and have come to the conclusion, the Lord hath blessed me, &c.*

groundlessly movedst me against him; Ps. 65, 9 so that they are afraid . . .; even a consequence which happens conditionally, Jer. 20, 17 וְיִתְּנִי so that my mother should have been . . . Another instance of the kind perhaps (if the text be correct) is Jer. 38, 9 וְיָמָּוּת so that he dies (must die).

m Rem. Such consecutive clauses frequently occur after interrogative sentences, e. g. Is. 51, 12 *who art thou* (i. e. art thou so helpless), מִי אַתָּה that thou art (must needs be) afraid? Ps. 144, 3 (comp. Ps. 8, 5, where in a very similar context כִּי that is used with the imperfect); Gen. 12, 19 (וְיִשְׁלַח); 31, 27 וְיִשְׁלַח so that I might have sent thee away; Job 11, 3 וְיִתְּנִי so that thou mockest.

4. As regards the range of time it is to be carefully noticed—

- n* (a) That the *imperfect consecutive* may represent all varieties of the relations of tense and mood, which, according to § 107. a, follow from the idea of the imperfect;
- o* (b) That the more precise determination of the range of time to which an *imperfect consecutive* relates must be inferred in each case from the character of the preceding tense (or tense-equivalent), to which it is attached, in a more or less close relation, as temporal or logical sequence. Thus the *imperfect consecutive* serves—
- p* (1) To represent actions, events, or conditions, which are *past* (or were repeated in past time), when it is united with tenses, or their equivalents, which refer to an actual past.
- q* Comp. the examples given above, under letters *a* and *f*, of the imperfect consecutive as an historic tense. The imperfect consecutive also frequently occurs as the continuation of a perfect (*praeteritum*) in a subordinate clause; e. g. Gen. 27, 1. Num. 11, 20. Deut. 4, 37. 1 Sam. 8, 8. 1 Ki. 2, 5. 11, 33. 18, 13, &c.; also in Is. 49, 7 וְיִתְּנִי is the continuation of a preterite, contained, according to the sense, in the preceding וְיִתְּנִי. In Job 31, 26. 34 the imperfect consecutive is joined to an imperfect denoting the past in a conditional sentence. An imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a perfect which has the sense of a pluperfect (§ 106. f), e. g. in Gen. 26, 18. 28, 6 sq. 31, 19. 34 (*now Rachel had taken the teraphim*, וְיִתְּנִי and had put them, &c.); Num. 14, 36. 1 Sam. 28, 3. 2 Sam. 2, 23. Is. 39, 1. Finally there are the cases in which an infinitival or participial construction representing past time, according to § 113. r, § 116. x, is taken up and continued by an imperfect consecutive.
- r* (2) To represent *present* actions, &c., in connexion with tenses, or their equivalents, which describe actions and conditions as being either present or lasting on into the present (continuing in their effect); so especially,

(a) In connexion with the present perfects, described in § 106. g, e.g. Ps. 16, 9 *therefore my heart is glad* (שִׂמְחָה) *and my glory rejoiceth* (וַיִּשְׂמַח); Is. 3, 16 (parallel with a simple imperfect). Comp. also such examples as Ps. 29, 10 וַיֵּשֶׁב (prop. he sat down, *and has been enthroned ever since*), Ps. 41, 13.

(β) In connexion with those perfects which represent experiences frequently confirmed (see § 106. k), e.g. Job 14, 2 *he cometh up* (וַיָּצֵא) *like a flower, and is cut down* (וַיִּפְּלֶה); *he fleeth* (וַיִּבְרַח) *also as a shadow, and continueth not*; Job 20, 15. 24, 2. 11. Is. 40, 24. Prov. 11, 2.

(γ) In connexion with imperfects which, in one of the ways described in § 107. 2, are used in the sense of the present; e.g. Job 14, 10 *but man dieth* (וַיָּמָת) *and wasteth away* (וַיִּחַדֵּשׁ), &c., i.e. remains wasted; Job 4, 5. 6, 21. Is. 44, 12 sqq. Hos. 8, 13. Hab. 1, 9 sq. Ps. 3, 5 (*I cry unto the Lord, and he answereth me*; cf. 55, 18); 90, 3. Job 5, 15. 7, 18. 12, 25. 34, 24. 37, 8 (parallel with a simple imperfect); 39, 15. In the apodosis of a conditional sentence, Ps. 59, 16, so also after an interrogative imperfect, 1 Sam. 2, 29. Ps. 42, 6 (וַתִּתְהַלֵּל for which in verse 12 and in 43, 5 we have וַתִּתְהַלֵּל and *why art thou disquieted?*).

(δ) In dependence on participles, which represent what at present continues or is being repeated, e.g. Num. 22, 11. 1 Sam. 2, 6. 2 Sam. 19, 2 *behold the king weepeth* (וַיִּבְכֶּה) *and mourneth* (וַיִּתְאַבֵּל) *for Absalom*; Am. 5, 8. 9, 5 sq. Nah. 1, 4. Ps. 34, 8. Prov. 20, 26. Job 12, 22 sqq., but comp. e.g. Job 12, 4 לֵאמֹר לַיהוָה *who called upon God, and he answered him*.

(ε) In dependence on other equivalents of the present, as in Is. 51, 12. Ps. 144, 3 (see above, letter m); Job 10, 22. So especially as the continuation of an infinitive, which is governed by a preposition (comp. § 114. r), Is. 30, 12. Jer. 10, 13. Ps. 92, 8, &c.

(3) To represent *future* actions, &c., in dependence on—(a) an imperfect which refers to the future, Ps. 49, 15. 94, 22 sq.;—(β) a perfect consecutive, or those perfects which, according to § 106. n, are intended to represent future events as undoubtedly certain, and therefore as though already accomplished (*perf. propheticum*); comp. Is. 5, 15 (parallel with a simple imperfect); 5, 16 (comp. 2, 11. 17, where the same threat is expressed by the perfect consecutive); 5, 25. 9, 5. 10 sq.

13. 15. 17 sqq. 22, 7 sqq. Joel 2, 23. Mic. 2, 13. Ezek. 33, 4. 6. Ps. 7, 13. 64, 8 sqq.;—(י) a future participle, Jer. 4, 16¹.

- x Rem. An imperfect consecutive in dependence on a perfect or imperfect, which represents an action occurring only conditionally, is likewise used only in a hypothetical sense, e.g. Job 9, 16 וְיַעֲנֵנִי אִם יִקְרָאֵנִי if I had called, and he had answered me, yet . . .; Ps. 139, 11 וְאֵפֶר if I should say (previously, in verse 8 sq., hypothetical imperfects are used).—In Is. 48, 18 sq. an imperfect consecutive occurs in dependence on a sentence expressing a wish introduced by וְיִשְׁמַח וְיִשְׂמַח וְיִשְׂמַח *uisinam* (וְיִשְׂמַח and it or so that it were equivalent to then should it be). Comp. also the examples mentioned above, under letter l (Jer. 20, 17) and m (Gen. 31, 27), where the imperfect consecutive expresses facts occurring contingently.

§ 112. The Perfect with Wāw Consecutive.

- a 1. The perfect, like the imperfect (§ 111), is used with *wāw consecutive* (comp. § 49. a; on the external differentiation of the perfect consecutive by a change in the position of the tone, see § 49. h) to express actions, events, or conditions, which are to be attached to what precedes, in a more or less close relation, as its *temporal* or *logical* consequence. And as, according to § 111. a, the narrative which begins with a perfect, or its equivalent, is continued in the imperfect consecutive, so, vice versa, the perfect consecutive forms the regular continuation to a preceding imperfect, or its equivalent; see the examples.

- b Rem. 1. This alternation of perfect and imperfect or their equivalents is a striking peculiarity of the *consecutio temporum* in Hebrew. It not only affords a certain compensation for the lack of forms for tenses and moods, but also gives to Hebrew style the charm of an expressive variety, an action conceived as being still in progress (*imperfect*, &c.) reaching afterwards in the *perfect* a calm and settled conclusion, in order to be again exhibited in movement in the imperfect, and vice versa². The strict regularity of this alternation belongs indeed rather

¹ Also in Jer. 51, 29 the imperfects consecutive are attached to the threat virtually contained in the preceding imperatives. On the other hand וְיִשְׂמַח Hos. 8, 10 would be very remarkable as expressing a future; the text is, however, certainly corrupt, and hence the Cod. Babyl. and the Erfurt MS. 3 endeavour to remedy it by וְיִשְׂמַח, and Ewald reads וְיִשְׂמַח.—In Ezek. 28, 16 (comp. Jer. 15, 6 sq.) וְיִשְׂמַח appears to announce an action irrevocably determined upon, and therefore represented as already accomplished; comp. the prophetic perfects in verse 17 sqq.

² It is difficult to give a proper explanation of this phenomenon (according to § 49. a, note, to be found only in the Canaanitish group of languages), when we have given up the theory of a special *wāw conversum* in the unscientific sense mentioned in § 49. b, note, at the end, and if we accept the fact that the *perfect*

to the higher style, and even then it depends upon the view and intention of the speaker, whether he wishes the action, &c., to be regarded as the logical consequence of what has preceded, or as simply co-ordinate with it, and so in the same tense.

2. A succession of any number of other *perfects consecutive* may be co-ordinated ^c with a *perfect consecutive* (comp. e.g. Ezek. 14, 13. Amos 5, 19. Ruth 3, 3, four perfects in each case, Is. 8, 7 five, Ex. 6, 6 sq. eight). It is true, however, of the perfect (as conversely of the *imperfect* acc. to § 111. c), that as soon as the *Wāw* is separated by any intervening word from the verb to which it belongs, an *imperfect* necessarily takes the place of the *perfect*, e.g. Gen. 12, 12 *when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say* (וַיֹּאמְרוּ), *This is his wife: and they will kill me* (וַיִּהְיוּ לְךָ אֵתְּ) *but they will save thee alive* (וַיִּחְיֶיךָ חַיָּה).

2. The perfect consecutive, like the imperfect consecutive, always ^d belongs to the period of time expressed by the preceding tense, or its equivalent, with which it is connected as the temporal or logical consequence. The particular cases may be classed under three heads: (a) the perfect consecutive in *immediate* dependence (see letter *e*), (b) in loose connexion (see letter *x*) with the preceding, and (c) the perfect consecutive at the beginning of the apodosis to other sentences, or what are equivalent to sentences (see letter *ff*).

3. The perfect consecutive in immediate dependence on the ^e preceding tense, or its equivalent, serves

(a) As a frequentative tense to express *past* actions, &c., i. e. actions repeatedly brought to a conclusion in the past, and follows tenses, or their equivalents, representing actions which have *continued* or been *repeated in the past*:

(a) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gen. 2, 6 וַיֵּרָם אֱדֵן *there went up a mist* (again and again) *from the earth, וַיִּשְׁקֶה וַיִּמְצָק* *and watered* (as it were, and it always watered afresh), &c. This frequentative use of the perfect consecutive is equally evident after frequentative imperfects,

and *imperfect consecutive* cannot possibly be used in a way which contradicts their fundamental character as described in §§ 106 and 107. In other words, even the *perfect consecutive* originally represents a finally completed action, &c., just as the *imperfect consecutive* represents an action which is only beginning, becoming or still continuing, and hence in any case incomplete. The simplest view is to suppose, that the use of the *perfect consecutive* originated from those cases, in which it had to express the conclusion (or final consequence) of an action which was continued (or repeated) *in past time* (see the examples above), and that this use was afterwards extended to other cases, in which it had to represent the temporal or logical consequence of actions, &c., still in progress, and thus in the end a regular interchange of the two tenses became recognised.

Gen. 2, 10 (וַיְהִי) *and it became afresh every time*; וַיְהִי would mean, and it became so once for all); 29, 2 sq. (four perfects consecutive referring to actions repeated daily); Ex. 33, 7-11 וַיֵּצֵא *he used to take at each new encampment the tent, וַיִּקַּח and to pitch it again every time without the camp*; notice, amongst the numerous frequent. perf. consec., the imperf. in vv. 7. 8. 9. 11, always in a frequentative sense; 34, 34 sq. Num. 9, 19. 21 (among several simple imperfects). 10, 17. Jud. 2, 19. 1 Sam. 2, 19 וַתַּעֲשֶׂה *she used to make . . . וַתְּהַלֵּךְ and brought it to him from year to year*; 27, 9 (וַיִּלְכֹּץ). 1 Ki. 14, 28. 2 Ki. 3, 25. 12, 15 (in verses 16 sq. imperfects occur again). So also in dependent sentences, Gen. 6, 4 (וַיִּלְרֶד) as a continuation of וַיֵּבֶר, Job 31, 29¹.

f (β) After an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Ex. 39, 3 (Samaritan וַתַּעֲשֶׂה). 1 Sam. 5, 7 (i see § 112. rr). 7; 16. 2 Sam. 15, 2. 16, 13 *and he threw stones at him, וַתַּעֲבִיר and cast dust continually*; 12, 16. 31. 2 Ki. 6, 10. 12, 11 sqq. 15. Jer. 37, 15. Job 1, 5.

g Rem. The frequentative perfect consecutive is sometimes joined even with imperfects consecutive which simply express one *single* action or occurrence in the past; thus Ex. 18, 26. 40, 31 sq. 1 Sam. 1, 4. 2 Sam. 15, 1 sq. 1 Ki. 14, 27 (comp. verse 28); 1 Ki. 18, 4. 2 Ki. 12, 10. For other examples of a loosely connected frequentative perfect consecutive, see below, letter *dd*.

h (γ) After a perfect, Gen. 37, 3 (וַיֵּשֶׁה לִּי) i.e. as often as he needed a new garment)²; Num. 11, 8. 1 Sam. 16, 14. 2 Ki. 3, 4³; in interrogative sentences, 1 Sam. 26, 9 *who has ever, &c.*; Ps. 80, 13. Job 1, 1. 4. Ruth 4, 7; Gen. 26, 10, to express that which might possibly have happened, *one of the people might lightly . . . , and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us*.

i (δ) After an infinitive, Amos 1, 11 וְלִפְדֹּם *because he did pursue his brother, וַיִּשְׁחָת and (on each occasion) did cast off all pity* (then an imperfect consecutive); after an infinitive absolute, Jos. 6, 13. 2 Sam. 13, 19. Jer. 23, 14.

¹ Also in Ezek. 44, 12 (where Stade, *ZAW.* v. 293, would read וַיִּהְיֶה and וַיְהִי) the unusual tenses may have been intentionally chosen: *because they continually ministered and so always became afresh . . .*

² Driver, on this passage, rightly refers to 1 Sam. 2, 19.

³ Amos 4, 7 would also come under this head, if וַיִּמְטְרוּ is really intended, and the statement refers to the past; וַיִּמְטְרוּ might, however, also be a perfect expressing positive assurance (§ 106. m), and the passage then belongs to letter *s*.

(e) After a participle, Is. 6, 3 (וְקָרָא, &c., frequentative, as a continuation of עֲשֵׂימִים, verse 2); 1 Sam. 2, 22. 2 Sam. 17, 17¹.

(ζ) After other equivalents of tenses, e.g. Gen. 47, 22 *the priests had a portion from Pharaoh, וַאֲכָלוּ and did eat* (year by year), &c.; 1 Ki. 4, 7.

(δ) To express *present* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical *m* consequence of actions or events which continue or are repeated in the present, especially such as have, according to experience, been at all times frequently repeated, and may be repeated at any time.

(a) After a simple imperfect, e.g. Gen. 2, 24 *therefore a man leaves* (וְעָזַב *is accustomed to leave*) . . . וְנָתַק *and cleaves*, &c., here, as frequently elsewhere, clearly with the secondary idea of purpose, i.e. in order to cleave; Is. 5, 11 (if וְהָיָה *is to be taken as a continuation of וְיָרִיסֶם*); Is. 28, 28. Jer. 12, 3. Hos. 4, 3. 7, 7. Ps. 90, 6. Job 14, 9; also in dependent clauses, Lev. 20, 18. Is. 29, 8. 11 sq. Amos 5, 19.

(β) After a participle, as the equivalent of a sentence representing *n* a contingent action, &c., e.g. Ex. 21, 12 מִכָּה אִישׁ וְמָתָה (instead of מִכָּה there is in verse 20, &c. וְזִי יָבֶה אִישׁ *if one smite a man and* (so that) *he die*, &c., Ex. 21, 16. Is. 29, 15. Amos 6, 1. Hab. 2, 12.

(γ) After an infinitive absolute, Jer. 7, 9 sq. *will ye steal, murder, o and commit adultery* (simple infinitives absolute; comp. § 113. ee), וּבֹאֲתֶם *and then come and stand before me . . . and say*, &c.; comp. below, letter u.

(c) To express *future* actions, &c., as the temporal or logical *p* consequence of tenses, or their equivalents, which announce or require such future actions or events. Thus—

(a) After imperfects in the sense of a simple future, e.g. Amos 9, 3 sq. מִשָּׁם אֶחָפֵשׂ וְלִסְתָּחֶתֶם *I will search and take them out thence*, &c.; Gen. 4, 14. 40, 13. 1 Sam. 17, 32. 2 Ki. 5, 11. Job 8, 6 sq. (also with a change of subject, Gen. 27, 12. Jud. 6, 16 and elsewhere); and in interrogative sentences, Gen. 39, 9. Ex. 2, 7. 2 Sam. 12, 18. 2 Ki. 14, 10. Amos 8, 8. Ps. 41, 6; comp. also Jud. 1, 11; in sentences

¹ That וְהִלְכָה, &c., are frequentatives (*the maidservant used to go repeatedly and tell them*) may be seen from וְלִכְּבוֹ (necessarily an imperfect, since it is separated from וְ by הָם) and וְיִכְלָו; on the other hand in verse 18 וְיִלְכָּו and וְיִלְכָּו of actions which happened but once.

expressing a wish, 2 Sam. 15, 4; as well as in almost all kinds of dependent clauses. Also in conditional clauses after **אם** Gen. 32, 9. Ex. 19, 5. 1 Sam. 1, 11, or **כי** Gen. 37, 26 or **הן** Jer. 3, 1; in final clauses after **למען** Gen. 12, 13. Num. 15, 40. Is. 28, 13; after **אשר** Deut. 2, 25 or **כִּי** Gen. 3, 22. 19, 19. 32, 12. Is. 6, 10. Amos 5, 6; in temporal clauses, Is. 32, 15. Jer. 13, 16; and in relative clauses, Gen. 24, 14. Jud. 1, 12. 1 Sam. 17, 26.

- q (β) After the jussive (or an imperfect in the sense of a jussive or optative) or cohortative, with the same or a different subject, e.g. Gen. 1, 14 sq. **וְהָיָה . . . יְהִי מְאֹרֶת** *let there be lights . . . and let them be, &c.*; Gen. 12, 3. 24, 4. 28, 3. 31, 44. 1 Ki. 1, 2. 22, 13. Ruth 2, 7. 1 Chron. 22, 11; after a jussive expressing an imprecation, Ps. 109, 10.
- r (γ) After an imperative, also with the same or a different subject, e.g. 2 Sam. 7, 5 **וְאָמַרְתָּ לָּהּ** *go and tell (that thou mayst tell), &c.*; Gen. 6, 14. 8, 17. 27, 43 sq. 1 Sam. 15, 3. 18. 1 Ki. 2, 36. Jer. 48, 26.
- s (δ) After perfects which express a definite expectation or assurance (comp. § 106. m and n), e.g. Gen. 17, 20 **וְהָיָה בְּרַכְתִּי אֹתוֹ וְהִפְרֵתִי אֹתוֹ** *behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, &c.*; Is. 2, 11. 5, 14; on Amos 4, 7 see above, note 3 on letter *h*; in an interrogative sentence, Jud. 9, 9. 11, 13.
- t (ε) After a participle, e.g. Gen. 7, 4 **וְאֶנֶכִּי מְסַמֵּר** *and I will cause it to rain . . . וְקָדַחְתִּי *and I will (i. e. in order to) destroy, &c.*; Jer. 21, 9; also with a different subject, Gen. 24, 43 sq. **וְהָיָה הַיָּתָד הַזֶּה** *the maiden which cometh forth (הַיָּתָד) . . . וְאָמַרְתִּי אֵלֶיהָ* *to whom I shall say . . . וְאָמַרְתָּ* *and she (then) shall say, &c.* This use of the perfect consecutive is especially frequent after a participle introduced by **וְהָיָה**, e.g. Gen. 6, 17 sq.; with a different subject 1 Ki. 20, 36. Amos 6, 14; after a complete noun-clause introduced by **וְהָיָה** (comp. § 140), Ex. 3, 13 **וְהָיָה כִּי יָבֹאוּ אֵלֶיךָ** *behold, I come (i. e. if I shall come) . . . וְאָמַרְתִּי לָהֶם* *and shall say unto them . . . וְאָמַרְתָּ* *and they (then) shall say, &c.*; 1 Sam. 14, 8 sq. Is. 7, 14. 8, 7 sq. 39, 6.*
- u (ζ) After an infinitive absolute, whether the infinitive absolute serves to strengthen the finite verb (see § 113. *ι*), e.g. Is. 31, 5, or is used as an emphatic substitute for a cohortative or imperfect (§ 113. *dd* and *ee*), e.g. Lev. 2, 6. Deut. 1, 16. Is. 5, 5. Ezek. 23, 46 sq.
- v (η) After an infinitive construct governed by a preposition (for

this change from the infinitive construction to the finite verb, cf. § 114. *r*), e.g. 1 Sam. 10, 8 וְהָיָה כִּי אֵלֶיךָ אֵלֹהִים וְהָיָה לְךָ אֵלֹהִים *till I come unto thee* (prop. until my coming) *and show thee*, &c.; Gen. 18, 25. 27, 45. Jud. 6, 18. Ezek. 39, 27; comp. 1 Ki. 2, 37. 42.

Rem. To the same class belong 1 Sam. 14, 24, where the idea of time precedes, *w* *until it be evening and until I be avenged*, &c., and Is. 5, 8, where the idea of place precedes, in both cases governed by וְ.

4. The very frequent use of the perfect consecutive in direct *x* dependence upon other tenses (see above, letters *d-v*) explains how it finally obtained a kind of independent force—especially for the purpose of announcing future events—and might depend loosely on sentences to which it stood only in a wider sense in the relation of a temporal or logical consequence. Thus the perfect consecutive is used—

(a) To announce *future* events, &c., in loose connexion with a further announcement, e.g. Gen. 41, 30 וְהָיָה בְּעֵת הַבָּאָה and two co-ordinate perfects consecutive, equivalent to *but then shall arise*, &c.; frequently so after וְהָיָה with a following substantive (1 Sam. 9, 8), or a participial clause (comp. the analogous instances above, letter *t*), e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 31 *behold, the days come, וְהָיָה כִּי אֵלֶיךָ אֵלֹהִים that I will cut off*, &c.; Is. 39, 6. Amos 4, 2. 8, 11. 9, 13, and very often in Jeremiah; after an expression of time, Ex. 17, 4. Is. 10, 25. 29, 17. Jer. 51, 33. Hos. 1, 4. Further, when joined to a statement concerning present or past facts, especially when these contain the reason for the action, &c., expressed in the perfect consecutive; comp. Is. 6, 7 *lo, this hath touched thy lips, וְנִסְתָּרָה מִפִּי חַטֹּאתֶיךָ therefore thine iniquity shall be taken away*, &c., Gen. 20, 11. 26, 22. Jud. 13, 3 (here in an adversative sense); Hos. 8, 14. In loose connexion with a noun-clause, a long succession of perfects consecutive occurs in Ex. 6, 6 sqq. Also in Amos 5, 26 וְהָיָה כִּי תִקַּח אֶת הַיָּדָה וְהָיָה לְךָ אֵלֹהִים may be an announcement *yea, ye shall take up*; comp., however, below, letter *rr*.

Rem. 1. Very frequently the announcement of a future event is attached by *y* means of וְהָיָה *and it shall come to pass* (comp. the analogous addition of a past by means of וְהָיָה, § 111, 2), after which the event announced (sometimes after a long parenthesis) follows in one or more (co-ordinate) perfects consecutive, Gen. 9, 14. 12, 12 (וְהָיָה כִּי = *if*, as in 46, 33. Ex. 1, 10. 22, 26 and frequently). 1 Ki. 18, 12. Is. 14, 3 sq. Amos 8, 9; or in the imperfect, Gen. 4, 14. Is. 2, 2. 3, 24. 4, 3. 7, 18. 21 sqq. (comp. 29, 8); or in the jussive, Lev. 14, 9. It very rarely happens that the verb which is thus loosely added, agrees in gender and

number with the following subject, as in Num. 5, 27. Jer. 42, 16 ^{וְהָיָה} (before ^{וְהָיָה}), and in Jer. 42, 17 ^{וְהָיָה} (before ^{וְהָיָה}).

- z 2. The jussive form ^{וְהָיָה} occurs (in the sense described in letter y) instead of ^{וְהָיָה} in 1 Sam. 10, 5. 2 Sam. 5, 24 (1 Chron. 14, 15). 1 Ki. 14, 5. Ruth 3, 4, although in the first three places a jussive is wholly inadmissible as regards the meaning, and even in Ruth 3, 4 (where an admonition follows) ^{וְהָיָה} would be expected (see below, letter bb). In 1 Ki. 14, 5, however, the form is merely a textual error, and the pointing should simply be ^{וְהָיָה}. In the other passages ^{וְהָיָה} (always before an infinitive with a preposition) stands at the beginning of the sentence at an unusually long distance from the principal tone, and hence is certainly to be explained according to § 109. k, except that in 1 Sam. 10, 5, &c., the simply rhythmical jussive form takes the place, not of the full imperfect form, but (exceptionally) of the perfect consecutive.

aa (b) To introduce a command or wish: Deut. 10, 19 *love ye therefore the stranger*; 1 Sam. 6, 5. 24, 16. 1 Ki. 2, 6 (in Gen. 40, 14 the precativ perfect consecutive, as elsewhere the cohortative, jussive, and imperative, is strengthened by means of ^{וְ}). So, also, in loose connexion with participial and other noun-clauses (see above, letter x), Gen. 45, 12 sq. 1 Ki. 2, 2 sq. Ruth 3, 3 sq. 3, 9. — In Gen. 17, 11 the perfect consecutive (^{וְהָיָה} and *ye shall be circumcised*, &c.) is used to explain a preceding command.

bb Rem. As in the cases mentioned above under letter y, the connexion may be made by means of ^{וְהָיָה}. Thus with a following perfect consecutive, e.g. Gen. 46, 33. 47, 24. Jud. 4, 20. Comp. also Gen. 24, 14, where the real wish, at least as regards the sense, is contained in the next sentence.

cc (c) To introduce a question, whether in loose connexion with another interrogative sentence (see above, letter p), e.g. Gen. 29, 15 *art thou my brother* (equivalent to, Surely thou art my brother), ^{וְעָבַדְתִּי} *shouldst thou then serve me for naught?* or with a positive statement, e.g. Ex. 5, 5 (^{וְהָיָה} *will ye then make them rest?*); 1 Sam. 25, 11, perhaps also Ps. 50, 21 (^{וְהָיָה}).

dd (d) To introduce actions frequently repeated (hence analogous to the numerous examples of a frequentative perfect consecutive, above, letter e), e.g. 1 Sam. 1, 3 (^{וְעָלָה} of annual festival journeys); 13, 21 (where, however, the text appears radically corrupt); 27, 9 (^{וְהָיָה}, i.e. every time, therefore continued by means of ^{וְהָיָה}); 1 Ki. 5, 7 (^{וְכָל־כֶּלֶבֶד}, parallel with a simple imperfect); 9, 25. Jer. 25, 4. Dan. 8, 4. — In Job 1, 4 sq. a series of frequentative perfects consecutive is interrupted by an imperfect consecutive, while a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitæ*) forms the conclusion. In Jer. 6, 17 a similar

perfect is expressly marked, by placing the tone on the final syllable (according to § 49. *h*), as parallel with the real perfects consecutive.

Rem. The loose connexion of *tempora frequentativa* by וְהָיָה (comp. the Rem. *ee* above, letters *y* and *bb*) is also very frequent in this sense; thus with a following perfect consecutive, Gen. 30, 41 sq. (but in verse 42 *a*, where the verb is separated from the *Wāw* by an insertion, we find וְהָיָה לָהֶם he used not to put them in, according to § 107. *c*); Gen. 38, 9. Ex. 17, 11. 33, 7 sqq. (see above, letter *e*). Num. 21, 9. Jud. 6, 3. 19, 30. 1 Sam. 16, 23 (followed by five perfects consecutive); 2 Sam. 15, 5; with a following imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae*), Jud. 2, 19. 2 Sam. 14, 26.—In Jud. 12, 5 וְהָיָה, contrary to what would be expected, is continued by means of the imperfect consecutive, and in 1 Sam. 13, 22 by וְהָיָה with the perfect (instead of the imperfect).

5. Finally the perfect consecutive is very frequently employed with *ff* a certain emphasis to introduce the apodosis after sentences (or what are equivalent to sentences) which contain a condition, a reason, or a statement of time. Moreover, such an apodosis, as in the cases already treated, may represent either future events, or commands and wishes, or even events which have been often repeated in the past. Thus—

(*a*) The perfect consecutive occurs in the apodosis to conditional sentences¹ (§ 159. *g*, *o*, *s*):

(*a*) After וְהָיָה with the imperfect, e.g. 2 Ki. 7, 4 וְהָיָה וְנָתַתָּם אִם-יָמִיתוּ אֹתָנוּ if they kill us, (well then) we shall but die; here the perfect consecutive is used obviously with greater emphasis than the imperfect (וְהָיָה) which immediately precedes; Gen. 18, 26. 24, 8. 41. 32, 9. Num. 30, 15. Jud. 4, 20. 1 Sam. 1, 11. 20, 6. 1 Ki. 3, 14. Nah. 3, 12. Eccles. 4, 11.

(*β*) After וְהָיָה with the perfect (in the sense of a *futurum exactum*), *gg* Num. 5, 27. 2 Ki. 5, 20. 7, 4 *a*. Is. 4, 4 sq.; as precativ apodosis after וְהָיָה with the *perf. preteritum*, Gen. 33, 10; as a frequentative perfect consecutive, to represent past events in the apodosis after וְהָיָה with a perfect, Num. 21, 9. Jud. 6, 3. Job 7, 4; after וְהָיָה with imperfect, Gen. 31, 8.

(*γ*) After וְהָיָה (in case, suppose that) with the imperfect, Gen. 12, 12. *hh* Ex. 18, 16. Jud. 13, 17. Is. 58, 7. Ezek. 14, 13². Frequentative with

¹ In a number of the examples of this kind the protasis is already loosely connected by means of וְהָיָה, and hence some of them had to be already mentioned above, letters *y*, *bb*, *ee*.

² In 1 Sam. 24, 19 a question appears to be expressed by the perfect consecutive, for if a man find his enemy, will he let him go well away? Probably, however, with Klostermann, וְהָיָה should be read for וְהָיָה.

reference to the past, after וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל with frequentative perfect, Jud. 2, 18. Job 7, 13 sq.

- ii (δ) After וְיִשְׁׁרָאֵל with the imperfect, Gen. 44, 9 $\text{וְיָמָּוּת . . . אִתּוֹ}$ *with whomsoever . . . it be found, let him die*; with the perfect, Ex. 21, 13 *and if a man lie not in wait, &c.*; Jud. 1, 12.

- kk (ε) Very frequently after a perfect consecutive (one or more) containing the condition, e.g. Gen. 44, 29 $\text{וְיִקְחוּם גַּם-אֶת-זֶה . . . וְהוֹרִידָם}$ *and if ye take (or shall have taken) this one also . . . ye shall bring down, &c.*; comp. Gen. 33, 13. 42, 38. 44, 4. 22. 47, 30. Num. 30, 12. Ruth 2, 9, and probably also Ezek. 39, 28. — Also frequentative in reference to the past, e.g. 1 Sam. 17, 34 sq. $\text{וּבָא הַלֵּוֹנִי . . . וַיֵּצֵאנִי}$ *and when there came (as sometimes happened) a lion . . . I went out, &c.*; Ex. 33, 10. Num. 10, 17 sqq. 1 Ki. 18, 10. Jer. 20, 9 (the perfects consecutive being regularly continued in the apodosis by וְלֹא with an imperfect¹).

- ll Rem. The perfect consecutive may be used also in the protasis to express a condition when the employment of the perfect consecutive in the apodosis has become impossible, owing to an emphatic word having to stand before it; thus in Ezek. 14, 14 on account of וְהִפָּחָה ; 33, 4 on account of דָּבָר . — In 1 Sam. 14, 52 the imperfect consecutive, contrary to what might be expected, stands in the apodosis, *and when Saul saw any . . . valiant man, he took him unto him*, where וַיִּטְּסֵהוּ suggests the special case, rather than a repeated occurrence; cf. 2 Sam. 15, 2. Conversely, in 1 Sam. 2, 16. 17, 35 ב an imperfect consecutive stands in the protasis.

- mm (ζ) After various equivalents of sentences, which contain a condition; thus, after a substantive standing absolutely, or a participle (a *casus pendens*), Gen. 17, 14 $\text{וְיִכָּרְתֶּהָ וְג' . . . וְעָרַל זָכָר}$ *and the uncircumcised male (in case such an one be found), he shall be cut off, &c.*; comp. Gen. 30, 32. Ex. 12, 15. 2 Sam. 14, 10. Is. 6, 13, and (after an infinitive with a preposition) 2 Sam. 7, 14; in a wider sense also Ex. 4, 21. 9, 19. 12, 44. Is. 9, 4.

- nn (δ) The perfect consecutive serves as the apodosis to causal clauses; thus e.g. after וְעַן קִי with the perfect, Is. 3, 16 sq.; after וְעַן אִשְׁרַי with perfect, 1 Ki. 20, 28; after וְעַתָּה with perfect, Num. 14, 24; also after what

¹ In all these examples (not only in the frequentative perfects consecutive) the original idea of the perfect, which also underlies the perfect consecutive, comes out very distinctly. Gen. 44, 29 (see above) implies in the mind of the speaker, If it ever shall have come to this, that ye *have taken* this one also, then ye *have* thereby brought me down to Sheol.

are equivalent to causal clauses, e.g. Ps. 25, 11 (וְלִפְנֵי שְׁמִי . . . וְסִלַּחְתָּ) *for thy name's sake . . . pardon . . .*; Is. 37, 29 after וְעַל with an infinitive.

(c) The perfect consecutive occurs as the apodosis to temporal clauses or their equivalents, e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 15 בְּתָרֵם יִקְטֹחַן אֶת־הַחֶלֶב . . . וְכֵאן נָעַר הַחֵזֶן *before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came* (used to come), &c., hence a frequentative perfect consecutive relating to the past, as in Ex. 1, 19; also after participial clauses (§ 116. w), e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 13 sq. וְכֵאן . . . וְכֵאן בְּלִי־אִישׁ זָבַח וְכֵאן *when(ever) any man offered sacrifice, then came, &c.* (so Jud. 19, 30. 2 Sam. 20, 12), with a frequentative perfect consecutive. The perfect consecutive is very frequently used to announce future actions or events after simple expressions of time of any kind; thus Gen. 3, 5. Ex. 32, 34 (after בְּיָוֶם with the infinitive), comp. also such examples as Num. 44, 30. Jud. 16, 2. Jos. 6, 10. 1 Sam. 1, 22. 16, 23 (numerous frequentative perfects consecutive after the infinitive with a preposition; so 2 Sam. 15, 5, see above, letter *ee*); 1 Sam. 20, 18. 2 Sam. 14, 26. 15, 10. Is. 18, 5; moreover, Ex. 17, 4. Is. 10, 25. 29, 17. 37, 26; even after single disconnected words, e.g. Ex. 16, 6 עֶרֶב יִרְעָתָם *at even* (when it becomes evening) *then ye shall know*; comp. verse 7. Lev. 7, 16. 1 Ki. 13, 31. Prov. 24, 27.

8. Finally there still remains a number of passages which cannot be classed with any of those hitherto mentioned. Of these, some are due to the influence of Aramaic modes of expression, while in others the text is evidently corrupt. In a few instances we can do no more than merely call attention to the incorrectness of the expression.

(a) The influence of the Aramaic construction of the perfect with ׀ as the narrative tense, instead of the Hebrew imperfect consecutive (comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des bibl. Aram.*, § 71. *b*), is certainly to be traced in *Qoheleth*, and sporadically in other very late Books¹, perhaps also in a few passages in the books of Kings, which are open to the suspicion of being due to later interpolation; so probably 1 Ki. 12, 32 וְהָעֶמִיד; 2 Ki. 11, 1 וְהָאֵתָה; 14, 14 וְלָקַח (in the parallel

¹ In the whole of *Qoheleth* the imperfect consecutive occurs only in 1, 17 and 4, 1. 7. Several of the perfects with ׀ can no doubt be explained as frequentatives, e.g. 1, 13. 2, 5. 9. 11. 13. 15. 5, 18 compared with 6, 2; but this is impossible in such passages as 9, 14 sqq. In *Ezra*, Driver reckons only five examples of historical perfects with ׀, in *Nehemiah* only six, and in *Esther* six or seven.

passage, 2 Chron. 25, 24, the word is wanting); 2 Ki. 23, 4 וְשָׁאָה, &c.; verse 10 וְשָׁאָה, &c.; verse 12 וְשָׁאָה, &c.; verse 15 וְשָׁאָה, &c.¹ Cf. also Ezek. 37, 2, 7, 10.

- 99 (b) The text is certainly corrupt in Is. 40, 6 (read with the LXX and Vulgate וְאָמַר); Jer. 38, 28, where the narrative breaks off in the middle of the sentence; 40, 3 וְהָיָה, &c., wanting in the LXX; also in Jud. 7, 13 וְנָפַל הָאֱהָרִי is altogether redundant; in 1 Sam. 3, 13 read, with Klostermann, the 2nd *sing. masc.* instead of וְהָיָה; in 1 Ki. 21, 12 וְהָיָה is, no doubt, incorrectly repeated from verse 9, where it is an imperative.

- 11 Of other questionable instances, (a) the following, at any rate, may also be explained as frequentatives, Ex. 36, 38, 38, 28, 39, 3. 1 Sam. 5, 7, 17, 20, 24, 11 (but even so וְאָמַר would be expected); Is. 28, 26 (parallel with an imperfect); Amos 5, 26 (unless it is rather, *yea, ye shall take up*; see above, letter x); Ps. 26, 3. Ezra 8, 36.

- 55 (b) A longer or constant continuance in a past state is perhaps represented by the perfect with וְ (as a variety of the frequentative perfect with וְ), in Gen. 15, 6, 34, 5. Num. 21, 20; also, according to Driver, especially Jos. 15, 3-11, 16, 2-8 (ultimately parallel with an imperfect, as in 17, 9 and 18, 20); 18, 12-21, 19, 11-14, 22, 26-29, 34; moreover, 1 Sam. 1, 12, 25, 20 (both times וְהָיָה); Is. 22, 14. Jer. 3, 9.

- 11 (γ) The following are due to errors in the text, or to incorrect modes of expression: Gen. 21, 25. Ex. 36, 29 sq. Jud. 3, 23², 16, 18. 1 Sam. 4, 19, 17, 38. 2 Sam. 16, 5, 19, 18 sq. (read וְעָלָה and וְיַעֲבֹר). 1 Ki. 3, 11 (where וְשָׁאָה is, no doubt intentionally, assimilated to the four other perfects); 13, 3, 20, 21, 21, 12 (unless the imperative וְקָרָא, &c., is intended); 2 Ki. 14, 7 (where, with Stade, וְאֶת־הַפֶּלַע תִּפְסֹחַ should be read); 14, 14, 18, 4 (where, at any rate, וְשָׁבַר might be taken as a frequentative, but not וְכָרַת, &c.; evidently the perfects are co-ordinated only in form with וְהָיָה הַקִּיר); Jer. 37, 15 (where וְהָיָה, but not וְתָנַח, might be frequentative); Ezek. 20, 22 וְהִשְׁבַּחְתִּי before an imperfect consecutive); Amos 7, 4 וְאֶכְלָה after an imperfect consecutive); Job 16, 12.

- 11 Finally, in 1 Sam. 10, 9, 17, 48. 2 Sam. 6, 16. 2 Ki. 3, 15. Jer. 37, 11. Amos 7, 2 וְהָיָה is to be read throughout instead of וְהָיָה, but in Gen. 38, 5 וְהָיָה with the LXX.

¹ According to Stade, *ZAW.* v. 291 sqq., where he discusses, in connexion with 2 Ki. 12, 12, a number of critically questionable perfects with וְ, the whole section, 2 Ki. 23, 4 from וְשָׁאָה to verse 5 inclusive, is to be regarded as a gloss, since the continuation of an imperfect consecutive by means of a perfect with וְ never occurs in pre-exilic documents, except in places where it is due to corruption of the original text. At the same time, the possibility of frequentative perfects consecutive (even immediately after imperfects consecutive), which has been supported above, letters f and g, by a large number of examples, does not appear to have been taken into account. In 2 Ki. 23, 5 also וְהִשְׁבַּחְתִּי, verse 8 וְתָנַח, and verse 14 וְשָׁבַר may, at any rate, be understood as representing repeated actions.

² Or does וְעָלָה, as a frequentative, imply fastening with several bolts? It is, at all events, to be noticed, that in 2 Sam. 13, 18 also וְעָלָה follows an imperfect consecutive.

B. THE INFINITIVE AND PARTICIPLE.

§ 118. *The Infinitive Absolute.*

Cf. the dissertation of J. Kahan, and, especially, the thorough investigation by E. Sellin, both entitled, *Ueber die verbal-nominale Doppelnatur der hebräischen Participien und Infinitive*, &c., Leipzig, 1889.

1. The infinitive absolute is employed according to § 45 to *a* emphasize the idea of the verb *in the abstract*, i.e. it speaks of an action (or condition) without any regard to the agent or to the conditions of time and mood under which it takes place. As the *name* of an action the infinitive absolute, like other nouns in the stricter sense, may form part of certain combinations (as a subject, predicate, or object, or even as a genitive¹, see below); but such a use of the infinitive absolute (instead of the infinitive construct with or without a preposition) is, on the whole, rare, and, moreover, open to question on critical grounds. On the other hand, the infinitive absolute frequently exhibits its character as an expression of the *verbal idea* by taking an object, either in the accusative or even with a preposition.

Examples of the use of the infinitive absolute :—

(a) As subject, Prov. 25, 27 **אֲכַל דְּבֶשׂ הָרְבוֹת לֹא מֹבִיל** *it is not good to eat much honey*; Jer. 10, 5. Job 6, 25. Eccles. 4, 17; as an explanation of a demonstrative pronoun, Is. 58, 5 sq. Zech. 14, 12.

(b) As predicate, Is. 32, 17 **וְהָיָה שָׁקֵט וְנִחָה** (is) *quietness* (prop. *to find rest*) and confidence.

(c) As object, Is. 1, 17 **לִמְדוּ הַיָּתֵב** *learn to do well*; Is. 7, 15. Prov. 15, 12; *d* according to the sense also Jer. 9, 23. 23, 14, as well as Is. 5, 5 (**וְיָרַח וְהָיָה** virtually depend on the idea of the wish contained in **עֲשֵׂה**); Is. 22, 13, where a long series of infinitives absolute is governed by **הִנֵּה**, and 59, 13 (six infinitives governed by **יִרְעֲשׂוּ** in verse 12); Deut. 28, 56 is strange since the object precedes the infinitive absolute which governs it², also Is. 42, 24, where the statement of place precedes the infinitive absolute.—In Jer. 9, 4. Job 13, 3 the infinitive absolute as the object of the verb is placed before it for the sake of emphasis (with the verb negated by **לֹא** in Is. 57, 20. Jer. 49, 23), so also in Lam. 3, 45 where it is the remoter object and co-ordinated with a substantive.

(d) As genitive, Is. 14, 23 **הַשְׁמֹר בְּמִטְאֵמָה הַשְׁמֹר** *with the besom of destruction*; *e* so perhaps also 4, 4 **בְּרִיחַ בָּעֵר**; comp. further, Prov. 1, 3. 21, 16. The infinitive

¹ The infinitive absolute can never be joined with a genitive or a pronominal suffix.

² Perhaps **הִנֵּה** according to § 53. *k* should be explained as an infinitive construct, or should be written **הַיָּתֵב**.

absolute is never used in immediate connexion with prepositions¹ (which as being originally substantives govern the genitive), but always the infinitive construct; but if a second infinitive is co-ordinated by ׀ with such an infinitive construct, it has the form of the infinitive absolute (since it is released from the immediate government of the preposition), e.g. 1 Sam. 22, 13 בָּתָּהָךְ לוֹ לֶחֶם . . . וְשָׁאַל לוֹ בְּאַלְהִים in that thou hast given him bread . . . and hast enquired of God for him; Ezek. 36, 3; 1 Sam. 25, 26. 33 (after מָן); after לֵ Ex. 32, 6. Jer. 7, 18. 44, 17.

f (e) Governing an accusative of the object, e.g. Is. 22, 13 הָיָן בָּקָר וְשֹׁחֹט צֹאן slaying oxen and killing sheep; comp. Ex. 20, 8. 23, 30. Deut. 5, 12. Is. 37, 19, and of the examples in a-d, Deut. 28, 56. Is. 5, 5. 58, 6 sq. Prov. 25, 27, &c.; followed by a preposition, e.g. Is. 7, 15 מָאֹס בָּרַע וְבָחֹר בְּטוֹב to refuse the evil and choose the good; Prov. 15, 12 (הוֹכִיחַ לוֹ).

g If the object be a personal pronoun, then, since the infinitive absolute can never be united with a suffix (see above, note on letter a), it is affixed by means of the accusative-sign אֶת (אֹת), e.g. Jer. 9, 23 וְיָדַע אֹתִי and knoweth me; Ezek. 36, 3.

h 2. Analogous to the use of the infinitive absolute as the accusative of the object, mentioned in letter d, is its employment as a *casus adverbialis*² in connexion with some form of the finite verb, to describe more particularly the manner or attendant circumstances (especially those of time and place) under which an action or condition has taken place, or is taking place, or will take place; e.g. Jer. 22, 19 הֵאָחֵז בְּחֹבוֹ וְהִשְׁלָךְ a drawing and casting forth, i.e. being drawn and cast forth, &c.; Gen. 21, 16 הֵרָחֵק a removing, i.e. distant; comp. Ex. 33, 7. Jos. 3, 16); Gen. 30, 32. Ex. 30, 36. Num. 6, 5. 23. 15, 35 (where a subject is added subsequently; see below, letter gg); Jos. 3, 17. 1 Sam. 3, 12 הָיָל וְכֵלָה a beginning and ending, i.e. from beginning to end); 2 Sam. 8, 2. Is. 7, 11 הַעֲמִיק and הִנְבִּיחַ, prop. a making deep . . . , and a making high, i.e. whether thy request extend to the world below or to the height above); 57, 17 הִסְתַּר in hiding, sc. my face); Jer. 3, 15 דָּעָה וְהִשְׂבִּיל with knowledge and understanding); Hab. 3, 13 עֲרוֹחַ, comp. for the form § 75. aa); Zech. 7, 3. Ps. 35, 16 הִקֵּץ, to define more precisely קָרַע verse 15); Job 15, 3³.

¹ ואחרי שֶׁחָה 1 Sam. 1, 9 is impossible Hebrew, and as the LXX shows, a late addition.

² That this *casus adverbialis* also was originally regarded as an accusative, may be seen from classical Arabic, where an infinitive of this kind expressly retains the accusative ending. In Latin the ablative of the gerund corresponds in many ways to this use of the infinitive absolute.

³ Also in 2 Ki. 21, 13 for קָרַע וְהִסְתַּר read with Stade and Klostermann קָרַע וְהִסְתַּר.

Rem. 1. To an adverbial infinitive absolute of this kind, there may further *i* be added a *casus adverbialis* (the accusative of state or condition), or even a circumstantial clause, to define more exactly the manner in which the action is performed, e.g. Is. 20, 2 *and he did so* הָלַךְ עָרוֹם וְיָחָף *walking naked and barefoot*, prop. in the condition of one naked, &c.; Is. 30, 14 *a breaking in pieces* (acc. to the reading בָּתוֹחַ; the Masora requires בְּתוֹחַ) *without sparing*.

2. A few infinitives of this kind, all of which are in Hiph'il, have, through *k* frequent use, come to be treated by the language as simple adverbs; so especially הַרְבֵּה (comp. § 75. ff) *multum faciendo*, i.e. *multum*, very frequently strengthened by מְאֹד *very* and even used without connexion with a finite verb (see the Lexicon); also הַיָּטֵב *bene faciendo*, i.e. *bene*, used especially to express the careful and thorough performance of an action (e.g. Dent. 13, 15); in Dent. 9, 21. 27, 8 it is added epexegetically to another adverbial infinitive absolute, in Jon. 4, 9 it twice precedes the verb for the sake of emphasis. Finally, הַשֶּׁמֶר *mane faciendo*, i.e. *early in the morning*, then in general *early* with the additional idea of earnestness; in 1 Sam. 17, 16 joined with the infinitive absolute וְהָעֶרֶב a denominative from עָרַב *evening* (*morning and evening*, i.e. *early and late*), elsewhere (with the exception of Prov. 27, 14) always joined with the infinitive absolute of the governing verb, e.g. Jer. 11, 7 *for I earnestly protested* (הָעֵרַתִּי) *unto your fathers . . .* הַשֶּׁמֶר *rising early and protesting*, i.e. with earnest protestation; Jer. 25, 3. 26, 5 (where † should be omitted before ה') ; Jer. 29, 19. 32, 33. 2 Chron. 16, 15.

3. The infinitive absolute occurs most frequently in immediate *l* connexion with the finite verb of the same stem, in order in various ways to *define more accurately* or *to strengthen the idea of the verb*¹.

These infinitives absolute joined immediately to the finite verb belong in a sense *m* to the *schema etymologicum* treated in § 117. p, i.e. they are objects of the finite verb in question, except that the infinitive absolute (as a *nomen abstractum*) lays stress rather on the actual occurrence or the energy of the action (see the examples below), while the noun proper emphasizes the result or extent of the action; comp. e.g. Ex. 22, 22 אֵלֵי אִם יִצְעַק אִם יִצְעַק if it actually happens that *he cries to me*, with Gen. 27, 34 (as it were, *he cried*, so that a great cry was heard).

We must further distinguish—

(a) The infinitive absolute used *before* the verb to strengthen the *n* verbal idea, i.e. to emphasize in this way either the certainty (especially in the case of threats) or the forcibleness and completeness of an occurrence. In English, such an infinitive is mostly expressed by

¹ Comp. A. Rieder, *Die Verbindung des Inf. abs. mit dem Verb. fin. desselben Stammes im Hebr.*, Leipz., 1872; also his *Quae ad syntaxin Hebraicam, qua infin. abs. cum verbo fin. eiusdem radices coniungitur, planiorem faciendam ex lingua Graeca et Latina afferantur*, Gumbinnen (Programm des Gymnasiums), 1884. G. R. Hauschild, *Die Verbindung finiter und infiniter Verbalformen desselben Stammes in einigen Bibelsprachen*, Frankfurt a. M., 1893, discussing especially the rendering of such constructions in the Greek and Latin versions.

a corresponding adverb, but sometimes merely by putting greater stress on the verb; e.g. Gen. 2, 17 *וְכָמֹחַ מוֹת תָּמוּת* *thou shalt surely die*, comp. 18, 10. 18. 22, 17. 28, 22. 1 Sam. 9, 6 (*cometh surely to pass*); 24, 21. Am. 5, 5. 7, 17. Hab. 2, 3. Zech. 11, 17; with the infinitive strengthened by *אָז* Gen. 44, 28 (but 27, 30 *and Jacob was yet scarce gone out, &c.*); Gen. 43, 3 *וַיַּעַן דָּוִד הָעֵד הָעֵד* *he did solemnly protest unto us*; 1 Sam. 20, 6 *וַיִּשְׁאַל דָּוִד וַיִּשְׁאַל* *David earnestly asked leave of me*; Jos. 17, 13, Jud. 1, 28 *וְהוֹרִישׁ לֹא הוֹרִישׁוּ* *and did not utterly drive them out*; especially typical instances are Am. 9, 8 *I will destroy it from off the face of the earth וְלֹא הִשְׁמִיד אֶשְׁמִיד וְג'* *saving that I will not utterly destroy, &c.*; Jer. 30, 11 *and will in no wise leave thee unpunished*; comp. further Gen. 20, 18. 1 Ki. 3, 26. Joel 1, 7. Job 13, 5.

o The infinitive absolute is used before the verb with less emphasis:

(1) Frequently at the beginning of the statement; cf. Driver on 1 Sam. 20, 6. However, in these cases a special emphasis on the following verb is sometimes intended; cf. above, letter *n*, on Gen. 43, 3. 1 Sam. 20, 6; also Gen. 3, 16. 26, 28. 32, 17. 1 Sam. 14, 28. 20, 3. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute is evidently used only as possessing a certain fullness of sound (hence for rhythmical reasons, like some uses of the separate pronoun, § 135. *a*), as in Gen. 15, 13. 43, 7. 20. Jud. 9, 8. 1 Sam. 10, 16. 23, 10. 2 Sam. 1, 6. 20, 18.

(2) Very frequently in conditional sentences after *אִם*, &c. The infinitive absolute in this case emphasizes the importance of the condition on which some consequence depends, e.g. Ex. 15, 26 *if thou wilt diligently hearken, &c.*, Ex. 19, 5. 21, 5. 22, 3. 11 sq. 16. 22 (see above, letter *m*); 23, 22. Num. 21, 2. 1 Sam. 1, 11. 12, 25; after *וְ* 1 Sam. 14, 30.

p The infinitive absolute is used to give emphasis to an antithesis, e.g. 2 Sam. 24, 24 *nay; but I will verily buy (קָנִי אֶמְצָא) it of thee, &c.* (not receive it as a gift); Jud. 15, 13 *no; but we will bind thee fast . . . but surely we will not kill thee*; comp. further Gen. 31, 30 (thou art indeed gone =) *though thou wouldst needs be gone* (Vulg. *esto*), *because thou sore longedst, &c.*; Ps. 118, 13. 18. 126, 6 (the second infinitive absolute as a supplement to the first—see below, letter *r*—comes *after* the verb).—Hence also, as permissive, Gen. 2, 16 sq. *אָכַל וְתָאֲכַל* *thou mayest freely eat, but, &c.* (so that verse 16 is in antithesis to verse 17); or concessive, 1 Sam. 2, 30 *I said indeed . . .*, 14, 43.

The infinitive absolute is used to strengthen a question, and *q* especially in impassioned or indignant questions, e.g. Gen. 37, 8 הֲיִשָּׁלְךָ עָלֵינוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה *shalt thou indeed reign over us?* Gen. 37, 10. 43, 7. Jud. 11, 25. 1 Sam. 2, 27. 2 Sam. 19, 43. Jer. 3, 1. 13, 12. Ezek. 28, 9. Amos 3, 5. Zech. 7, 5; but comp. also Gen. 24, 5 *must I needs bring again?*

(*b*) The infinitive absolute *after the verb*, sometimes (as in letter *n*) *r* to intensify¹ the idea of the verb (especially after imperatives and participles, since the infinitive absolute can never precede either, e.g. Num. 11, 15. Job 13, 17. 21, 2. 37, 2 שָׁמַעַתְּ שָׁמַעַתְּ *hearken ye attentively*; Jer. 22, 10; after participles, e.g. Is. 22, 17, also elsewhere, e.g. Num. 23, 11. 24, 10 *thou hast altogether blessed them*; Jos. 24, 10. 2 Ki. 5, 11. Dan. 11, 10, and with the infinitive absolute strengthened by means of בְּ Gen. 31, 15. 46, 4. Num. 16, 13); sometimes to express the long *continuance* of an action; here again after an imperative, Is. 6, 9 שָׁמַעַתְּ שָׁמַעַתְּ *hear ye continually*; after a perfect, Jer. 6, 29; after a participle, Jer. 23, 17; after an imperfect consecutive, Gen. 19, 9. Num. 11, 32.

To this class belong especially those cases in which a second *s* infinitive absolute is co-ordinated with the first; the latter then expresses either an accompanying or antithetical action or the aim to which the principal action is directed; e.g. 1 Sam. 6, 12 הָלַכְוּ הָלַכְוּ *lowing as they went* (lowing continually; so after a participle, Jos. 6, 13 *b* *Q^{re}*); Gen. 8, 7 *it went forth to and fro*²; Is. 19, 22 *smiling and* (i.e. but also) *healing again*; Joel 2, 26 (see above, letter *m*).

Rem. 1. Instead of a second infinitive absolute (see above) there is sometimes *t* found a perfect consecutive (Jos. 6, 13 *a* and 2 Sam. 13, 19, in both places as perfect frequentative; Is. 31, 5 referring to the future, unless with Stade, *ZAW.* vi. 189, we read וְהָיָה וְהָיָה and וְהָיָה וְהָיָה), or an imperfect consecutive (1 Sam. 19, 23. 2 Sam. 16, 13) or participle (2 Sam. 16, 5); comp. also letter *u*.

2. The idea of long *continuance* is very frequently expressed by the verb הָלַךְ *n* *to go*, along with its infinitive absolute, or even by the latter alone, and this occurs not only when it can be taken in its literal sense (*to go, to walk*, as in the examples given above, Jos. 6, 13. 1 Sam. 6, 12. 2 Sam. 13, 19; comp. also, Is. 3, 16, where both infinitives stand *before* the verb, and Ps. 126, 6, where הָלַךְ precedes),

¹ In Arabic also, the intensifying infinitive regularly stands *after* the verb, but in Syriac *before* the verb.

² Also in Ezek. 1, 14 for the involved form וְהָיָה וְהָיָה read simply וְהָיָה וְהָיָה.

but also in cases where הָלַךְ in the sense of *to go on, to continue*, merely performs the function of an adverb. The action itself is added in a second infinitive absolute, or sometimes (see above, letter *t*) in a participle or verbal adjective. Examples, Gen. 8, 3 הָלַךְ וְשׁוּב הַמַּיִם . . . הָלַךְ and the waters returned . . . continually; Gen. 8, 5. 12, 9. Jud. 14, 9. 2 Ki. 2, 11; with a participle following, Jer. 41, 6 (unless we read וַיָּבֹכֶה, as in 2 Sam. 3, 16); with an adjective following, Gen. 26, 13. Jud. 4, 24. 1 Sam. 14, 19. 2 Sam. 5, 10 (1 Chron. 11, 9). 2 Sam. 18, 25¹.

On the other hand, in 1 Sam. 17, 41 the participle הָלַךְ is used instead of the infinitive absolute; of a different kind are the instances in which the participle הָלַךְ is used as predicate along with the co-ordinate adjective (Ex. 19, 19. 1 Sam. 2, 26. 2 Sam. 3, 1. 15, 12. Est. 9, 4. 2 Chron. 17, 12) or participle (1 Sam. 17, 12. Jon. 1, 11. Prov. 4, 18).

- v 3. The regular place of the negative is between the intensifying infinitive absolute and the finite verb², e.g. Ex. 5, 23 לֹא הֵצִילְתָּ אֶת עַמְּךָ neither hast thou delivered thy people at all, Jud. 15, 13. Jer. 13, 12. 30, 11; comp. Mic. 1, 10 (אֵל). Exceptions are Gen. 3, 4 (where the negation of the threat pronounced in 2, 17 is expressed in the same form of words); Amos 9, 8. Ps. 49, 8.
- w 4. With a finite verb of one of the derived conjugations, not only the infinitive absolute of the same conjugation may be connected (Gen. 28, 22 Pi'el; 17, 13. Ex. 22, 3. Ezek. 14, 3 Niph'al; Gen. 40, 15 Pu'al; Hos. 4, 18 Hiph'il; Ezek. 16, 4 Hoph'al), but also (especially with Niph'al, rarely with Pi'el and Hiph'il; see Driver on 2 Sam. 20, 18) that of Qal as the simplest and most general representative of the verbal idea, 2 Sam. 20, 18 (with Pi'el), Gen. 44, 28 (with Pu'al; but in Gen. 37, 33 בָּרַךְ is a passive of Qal, § 52. e); 46, 4 (with Hiph'il); Ex. 19, 13. 21, 20. 2 Sam. 23, 7. Is. 40, 30. Jer. 10, 5. Job 6, 2 (with Niph'al); Is. 24, 19 (with Hithpo'el; הָיָה in the same verse must, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute Qal; see § 67. o), and so always מוֹת יָבֹקֵחַ he shall surely be put to death. Elsewhere the infinitive absolute of a conjugation with kindred meaning is found, Lev. 19, 20. 2 Ki. 3, 23 (Hoph'al for Niph'al); 1 Sam. 2, 16 (Pi'el for Hiph'il, unless יִשְׁמְרוּן is to be read); Ezek. 16, 4 (Hoph'al for Pu'al)³. Finally, the infinitive absolute may equally well be represented by a substantive of kindred stem⁴, 1 Sam. 1, 6. Is. 24, 16. 22. 35, 2 (אֲרֵי-יָלִית); Jer. 46, 5. Ezek. 25, 15.

¹ Comp. in French, *Le mal va toujours croissant, la maladie va toujours en augmentant et en empirant*, 'continually increases and becomes worse and worse.'

² Comp. Rieder, *Quo loco ponantur negationes לֹא et אֵל, conjunctio וְ, particula כִּי, cum conjuncta leguntur cum infin., quem absolutum grammatici vocant, verbo finito eiusdem radices addito* (*Zeitschrift für Gymn.-Wesen*, 1879, p. 395 sqq.).

³ In three passages even the infinitive absolute of another stem kindred in sound occurs; but in Is. 28, 28 אֲדַרְשׁ is no doubt a mere textual error for דַּרְשׁ, and in Jer. 8, 13, according to § 72. aa, we should read אֲדַסֵּם, and in Zeph. 1, 2 אֲדַקֵּם.

⁴ On these substantives (and on the use of the infinitive absolute generally as absolute object, see above, letter *m*), cf. the *schema etymologicum* treated in connexion with the government of the verb in § 117. p.

27, 35. Mic. 4, 9. Hab. 3, 9. Job 27, 12.—In Is. 29, 14 the substantive intensifying the verb is found *along with* the infinitive absolute.

5. Instead of the infinitive absolute immediately connected with the finite verb, α an infinitive construct form appears (cf. § 73. *d*), in Num. 23, 25 (בָּנִים לְךָ); comp. Ruth 2, 16 (בָּנִים לְךָ); Jer. 50, 34 (רִיב יָרִיב); Prov. 23, 1 (בֵּין תִּבְרִין). In the last instances the infinitive is probably assimilated to the imperfect, like the infinitive Niph'al in the forms noticed in § 51. *k* and note.—Cf. also 2 Ki. 3, 24 (חָבְאוּ בָא וְהָפֹת אֶת־מִצָּאָה) (read so with the LXX) before א, hence, no doubt due to the dislike of a hiatus; so in Ps. 50, 21. Neh. 1, 7 (חָבַל), all in rapid style; after the verb, Jos. 7, 7, unless הִעָּבִיר is intended.

4. Finally the infinitive absolute frequently appears as *a substitute* y *for the finite verb*, either when it is sufficient to mention simply the verbal idea (see letter z), or when the hurrying or otherwise excited discourse intentionally contents itself with this infinitive, in order to bring out the verbal idea in a clearer and more expressive manner (see letter *aa*).

(*a*) The infinitive absolute as the continuation of a preceding finite z verb. In the later Books especially it frequently happens that in a succession of several acts only the first (but sometimes several) of the verbs is inflected, while the second (or third, &c.) is added simply in the infinitive absolute. Thus after several perfects, Dan. 9, 5 (comp. verse 11) *we have sinned . . . and have transgressed thy law, וְסוּר and have turned aside* (prop. *a turning aside* took place); so after a perfect, Ex. 36, 7 (?). 1 Sam. 2, 28. Is. 37, 19. Jer. 14, 5. 19, 13. Hag. 1, 6 (four infinitives). Zech. 3, 4. 7, 5. Eccles. 8, 9. 9, 11. Est. 3, 13. 9, 6. 12, 6 sqq. Neh. 9, 8. 13. 1 Chron. 5, 20. 2 Chron. 28, 19¹; after the perfect consecutive, Zech. 12, 10; after the perfect frequentative, 1 Ki. 9, 25 (unless וְהִקְטִיר be intended); after the simple imperfect, Lev. 25, 14. Num. 30, 3. Jer. 32, 44 (three infinitives). 36, 23. 1 Chron. 21, 24; after the imperfect consecutive, Gen. 41, 43 (as a continuation of וַתִּרְבֶּה); Ex. 8, 11. Jud. 7, 19. Jer. 37, 21. Neh. 8, 8. 1 Chron. 16, 36. 2 Chron. 7, 3; with א or after the jussive, Deut. 14, 21. Est. 2, 2. 6, 9; after the imperative, Is. 37, 30 *b*. Amos 4, 4 sq.; after the participle, Hab. 2, 15 (strengthened by אִם, and regarded, like the participle itself, as an adverbial accusative); Est. 8, 8.

(*b*) At the beginning of the narrative, or at least of a new section *aa*

¹ In Ezek. 7, 14 a perfect is continued by means of an infinitive construct; it is, however, plain that the text is wholly corrupt; Cornill reads הִקְטִיר וְהִקְטִיר הִכֵּן.

of it. The special form of the finite verb which the infinitive absolute represents must be determined from the context. The infinitive absolute is most frequently used in this way, corresponding to the infinitive of command in Greek, &c.¹—

- bb* (a) For an emphatic imperative, e.g. שְׁמֹר (thou shalt, ye shall) *observe* Deut. 5, 12; זָכוֹר (thou shalt) *remember* Ex. 13, 3. 20, 8 (the full form of expression occurs in Deut. 6, 17 שְׁמֹר הַשְּׁמִירָן; 7, 18 זָכוֹר תִּזְכֹּר); Lev. 2, 6. Num. 4, 2. 25, 17. Deut. 1, 16. 2 Ki. 5, 10. Is. 38, 5. Jer. 2, 2, followed by a perfect consecutive; Jos. 1, 13. 2 Ki. 3, 16. Is. 7, 4. 14, 31 (parallel with an imperative; in Nah. 2, 2 three imperatives follow). But הִבֵּיתָ Ps. 142, 5 may be only an incorrect spelling of הִבֵּיתָ imperative².
- cc* (β) For the jussive, Lev. 6, 7. Num. 6, 5. 2 Ki. 11, 15. Ezek. 23, 46; comp. also Prov. 17, 12 (*let it rather meet*).
- dd* (γ) For the cohortative, 1 Ki. 22, 30 (2 Chron. 18, 29), I will *disguise myself, and go into the battle*; Is. 22, 13 בִּלְשׁוֹן הַמְּצַחֵם (the exclamation of the mocker); Ezek. 21, 31. 23, 30. 46; perhaps also Jer. 31, 2 (הִלֵּיף). Jos. 9, 20, co-ordinated by means of ׀ with a cohortative³.
- ee* (δ) For the imperfect in emphatic promises, e.g. 2 Ki. 4, 43 ye shall *eat and leave thereof*; 19, 29 (Is. 37, 30). 2 Chron. 31, 10; also in indignant questions, Job 40, 2 *shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty*? (on the addition of the subject comp. the Rem. below); Jer. 3, 1 *and thinkest thou to return again to me*? Jer. 7, 9 sqq. (six infinitives, continued by means of the perfect consecutive; comp. § 112. o).
- ff* (ε) For any historical tense (like the Latin *historic* infinitive) in lively narration (or enumeration) and description, even of what is still taking

¹ Comp. also such infinitives in French as *voir* (page so and so, &c.), *s'adresser* . . . , *se mêler des voleurs*!

² In Ezek. 21, 31, for the infinitives construct הִסְרִי, הָרִים, הַשְׁבִּיל (beside הִנְבֵּה) read with Cornill the infinitives absolute הִסֵּר, &c. The Kthfbh probably intends הִסֵּר, &c.

³ In 2 Sam. 3, 18 the infinitive construct appears instead of the cohortative, but הִלֵּיף should certainly be read for הִלֵּיף.

⁴ In Job 34, 18 in a similar question instead of the infinitive constr. we should rather expect the infinitive absolute (הִלֵּיף), unless with the LXX and Vulg. the participle הִלֵּיף is to be read.

place in present time, e.g. Hos. 4, 2 *swearing and breaking faith, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery* (in these they are busied); 10, 4 (after a perfect); Is. 21, 5. 59, 4. Jer. 8, 15. 14, 19. Job 15, 35; comp. further Jer. 32, 33. Eccles. 4, 2.—In Ezek. 23, 30. Prov. 12, 7. 15, 22 and 25, 4, the infinitive absolute is best rendered by the passive.

Rem. The subject is sometimes added to the infinitive absolute when it takes *gg* the place of the finite verb, e.g. Lev. 6, 7. Deut. 15, 2. Prov. 17, 12. Job 40, 2. Eccles. 4, 2. Est. 9, 1 (so, probably, also in Gen. 17, 10. Ex. 12, 48, although here *לִפְנֵי* according to § 121. *a* might also be taken as *an object* with a passive verb; comp. Est. 3, 13); the subject follows an adverbial infinitive absolute in Num. 15, 35 (see above, letter *h*) and Ps. 17, 5; and in 1 Sam. 25, 26. 33 it follows an infinitive absolute which is co-ordinated with an infinitive construct, see above, letter *e*.

§ 114. The Infinitive Construct.

1. The infinitive construct, like the infinitive absolute, may also *a* represent a *nomen verbale* (§ 45. *a*), but of a much more flexible character than the infinitive absolute (comp. § 113. *a*). Its close relation with nouns properly so called is especially seen in the readiness with which the infinitive construct may be used for any case whatever; thus,

(*a*) As the nominative of the subject, e.g. Gen. 2, 18 *לֹא-טוֹב הָיִיתָ* *the being of man in his separation*; *לְבַדּוֹ הָאָדָם*, literally, *not good is the being of man in his separation*; Gen. 30, 15. 1 Sam. 23, 20. Is. 7, 13. Prov. 17, 26. 25, 7. 24 (but comp. 21, 9 *לִשְׁכַּת טוֹב* in the same statement); Ps. 32, 9, prop. *there is not a coming near unto thee*, but the text is probably corrupt. With a *feminine* predicate, 1 Sam. 18, 23. Jer. 2, 17.

(*b*) As genitive, e.g. Eccles. 3, 4 *זֶמַן מְאֻד וְזֶמַן רִקּוֹד* *a time of mourning and a time of dancing*; Gen. 2, 17. 29, 7. Neh. 12, 46. 2 Chron. 24, 14. This equally includes, according to § 101. *a*, all those cases in which the infinitive construct depends on a preposition (see below, letter *d*).

(*c*) As accusative of the object, e.g. 1 Ki. 3, 7 *לֹא יָדַעְתִּי צֵאת וְבֵאת* *I know not the going out or the coming in* (*I know not how to go out and come in*); Gen. 21, 6. 31, 28. Num. 20, 21. Is. 1, 14. 37, 28 (even with *אֵת*). Jer. 6, 15. Job 15, 22 (comp. for the use of the infinitive absolute as object, § 113. *f*); as accusative with a verb expressing fullness, Is. 11, 9.

2. The construction of the infinitive with prepositions (as in Greek, *d*

ἐν τῇ εἰσελθῶν, διὰ τὸ εἰσελθῶν, &c.) may usually be resolved in English into the finite verb with a conjunction, e. g. Num. 35, 19 בְּפָגְעוֹ בּוֹ *in his meeting him*, i. e. if (as soon as) he meets him; Gen. 27, 45 (עַד-שָׁמַיִם); Is. 30, 12 יֵצֵן מֵאַסְפֶּכֶם *because ye despise*; Jer. 2, 35 עַל-אֶמְרוֹ *because thou sayest*; Gen. 27, 1 and his eyes were dim מֵרְאוֹת *from seeing*, i. e. so that he could not see.

e This use of the infinitive construct is especially frequent in connexion with וְ or כִּי to express time-determinations (in English resolved into a temporal clause, as above the combination of the infinitive with יֵצֵן or עַל- is resolved into a causal clause), especially after וְהָיָה (see the examples, § 111. *g*), e. g. 1 Sam. 2, 27 בְּהֵיטָוֶתָם בְּמִצְרַיִם *when they were in Egypt*; Gen. 24, 30 וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וְ... וְכָרָאת אֶת-הַחֲנֻךְ *and it came to pass, when he saw (prop. in the seeing) the ring . . . , and when he heard (prop. in his hearing), &c.*

f But by far the most frequent is the connexion of the infinitive construct with לְ. Starting from the fundamental meaning of לְ, i. e. *direction towards something*, infinitives with לְ serve to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim, and very commonly also (with a weakening or a complete disregard of the original meaning of the לְ) to introduce the object of an action, or finally even (like the infinitive absolute used adverbially, § 113. *h*, and the Latin gerund in *-ndo*) to state motives or attendant circumstances. See the instances in the Remarks.

g Rem. 1. The original meaning of the לְ is most plainly seen in those infinitives with לְ which expressly state a purpose (hence as the equivalent of a final clause), e. g. Gen. 11, 5 and the Lord came down, לְרַאֲתָא אֶת-הָעִיר *to see the city*; also with a change of subject, e. g. 2 Sam. 12, 10 and thou hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite לְהָיִיתָ לָּהּ לְאִשָּׁה *to be* (i. e. that she may be) *thy wife*; comp. Gen. 28, 4. Jer. 38, 26 (לְמַעַן).—If there is a special emphasis on the infinitive with לְ, it is placed, with its complement, before the governing verb, e. g. Gen. 42, 9. 47, 4. Num. 22, 20. Jos. 2, 3. 1 Sam. 16, 2 (cf. Driver on the passage) with בּוֹא; Jud. 15, 10. 1 Sam. 17, 25 with עָלָה.

¹ Comp. § 45. *g*, according to which the close union of the לְ with the first consonant of the infinitive (לְכָתֹב with a firmly closed syllable, as opposed to כָּתֹב, פָּתֹב, &c.) seems to point to the formation of a special new verbal form. Quite distinct are the few examples where the infinitive with לְ serves to express time, as Gen. 24, 63 לְסֵנוֹת עָרֶב *at the eventide* (prop. at the time of the return of evening); comp. Deut. 23, 12; Ex. 14, 27. Jud. 19, 26; 2 Sam. 18, 29 *when Joab sent the king's servant*.

2. Just as clearly the idea of aiming at a definite purpose or turning towards an object may be seen in the combination of the verb *הָיָה* to be, with *לְ* and an infinitive. In fact *הָיָה לְעֵשׂוֹת* may mean, either (a) *he was in the act of, he was about to* (as it were, he set himself), *he was ready, to do something*, or (b) *he or it was appointed or compelled, &c.*, to do the action in question. In the latter case *הָיָה לְעֵשׂוֹת* corresponds to the Latin *faciendum erat*, comp. also the English *I am to give*. In both cases *הָיָה* (as elsewhere when copula) is often omitted.

Examples of (a) Gen. 15, 12 *וַיְהִי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ לָבוֹא* and *when the sun was going i* down (just about to set); 2 Chron. 26, 5 *וַיְהִי לְדָרֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים* and *he set himself to seek God* (here with the secondary idea of a continuous action); with the omission of *הָיָה* Is. 38, 20, *לְהַשְׁמִיעֲנִי יְהוָה* the Lord is ready to save me; 1 Sam. 14, 21 (?). Jer. 51, 49. Ps. 25, 14 (*et foedus suum manifestaturus est eis*); Prov. 18, 24 (?). 19, 8 (*לְמַצֵּא* consecuturus est); 20, 25. Eccles. 3, 15 *לְהֵיוֹת אִשָּׁר* quod futurum est; 2 Chron. 11, 22. 12, 12 (in a negative statement); in a question, Est. 7, 8 (*will he even . . . ?*). Comp. also 1 Sam. 4, 19.

Of (b) Jos. 2, 5 *וַיְהִי הַשַּׁעַר לִסְגּוֹר* and *the gate was to be shut* (had to be shut); Is. 37, 26. Ps. 109, 13¹. Mostly with the omission of *הָיָה*, e.g. 2 Ki. 4, 13 *מָה לַעֲשׂוֹת לָךְ וְנִי* (lit. is it to be) *spoken for to the king, &c.*² 2 Ki. 13, 19 *לְהַכּוֹת* it was to smite equivalent to *thou shouldest have smitten*; Is. 5, 4. 10, 32. Ps. 32, 9. 68, 19 (?). Job 30, 6 (*habitandum est iis*). 1 Chron. 9, 25. 22, 5. 2 Chron. 8, 13 (?). 36, 19 (?). Hos. 9, 13. Hab. 1, 17. In a question 2 Chron. 19, 2.

Of the same kind also are the cases, in which the infinitive with *לְ* depends on the idea of an obligation or permission (or prohibition); especially in such forms of expression as 2 Sam. 18, 11 *עָלַי לָתֵת לָךְ וְנִי* it was upon me, i.e. it would have been *my duty to give thee, &c.*³; comp. Mic. 3, 1 (2 Chron. 13, 5) *is it not for you to* (i.e. are ye not bound to)⁴ with a negative, 2 Chron. 26, 18 *וְנִי לֹא* it pertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but only to the priests; also *לֹא* with an infinitive expresses *it is not permitted* (nefas est), *may not*, e.g. Est. 4, 2 *אֵין לָבוֹא* for none might enter; 8, 8. 1 Chron. 15, 2⁴; *אֵין* with an infinitive is used in a somewhat different sense, equivalent to *it is not*

¹ Somewhat different are the cases where *הָיָה* with the infinitive (which is then used exactly as a substantive) implies *to become something*, i.e. to meet with a particular fate, as Num. 24, 22 (comp. Is. 5, 5. 6, 13) *לְבַעַר* for wasting, for which elsewhere frequently *לְשַׂמּוֹת* and the like; probably also *לְבַלּוֹת* Ps. 49, 15 is to be explained in this way, the *הָיָה* being omitted.

² 2 Sam. 4, 10 (*cui dandum erat mihi*) appears to be similar; it may, however, be better, with Wellhausen, to omit the *אִשָּׁר*.

³ But in 1 Sam. 23, 20 after *וְנִי* and *our part shall be* the infinitive without *לְ* stands as the subject of the sentence.

⁴ Quite different of course are such cases as Is. 37, 3 *וְנִי לְלָחֵם* and *there is not strength to bring forth*; comp. Num. 20, 5. Ruth 4, 4.

feasible, not possible, e.g. in Ps. 40, 6. Eccles. 3, 14. 2 Chron. 5, 11¹.—With either meaning לא can be used instead of אין, e.g. Amos 6, 10 להקביר לא nefas est, to make mention of the name of the Lord: but Jud. 1, 19 for it was not possible to drive out, &c., perhaps, however, the text originally stood as in Jos. 17, 12 לא יכלו לה; 1 Chron. 15, 2.

3. A further class comprises the very numerous cases, in which the infinitive with ל is used as the object² of a governing verb (hence, again, the direction which an action takes). The verbs (or conjugations) which occur most frequently in this combination with ל and the infinitive are: הָחֵל (with an infinitive without ל, e.g. Deut. 2, 25. 31. Jos. 3, 7), הוֹאִיל, הוֹסִיף, הוֹסִיף (prop. to add) to continue, very frequently, even in prose, with an infinitive without ל, as Gen. 4, 12. 8, 10. 12. 37, 5. 1 Sam. 3, 8. Job 27, 1, &c.; חָדַל to cease from, to desist; כָּמַל to complete, to make an end of; תָּמַם to be finished; הִקְרִיב to come near to, Gen. 12, 11; סָהַר to hasten (with an infinitive without ל Ex. 2, 18); אָבָה to be willing (with an infinitive without ל Is. 28, 12. 30, 9. Job 39, 9); חָפֵץ to will, to desire; סָאָן to refuse (to be unwilling); בָּקַשׁ to seek; יָכַל to be able (with an infinitive without ל, e.g. Gen. 24, 50. 37, 4. Ex. 18, 23. Job 4, 2); נָתַן with an accusative of the person in the sense of to give up some one, to cause, to permit something to be done, e.g. Gen. 20, 6. Ps. 16, 11 (with an infinitive without ל Job 9, 18), יָדַע to understand how to do something (in Job 3, 8 הַעֲתִידִים עָרַר is analogous); לָמַד to learn; קָחָה to expect (with a change of subject, e.g. Is. 5, 2 and he looked that it should bring forth grapes).

4. We must further mention here a number of verbs in Hiph'il (partly denominatives), which express an action in some definite direction (comp. § 53. f), as הִנְדִּיל to do greatly, הִשְׁפִּיל to make (it) low, הִנְבִּיֵה, הִנְבִּיֵה to make (it) high, הִעֲמִיק to make (it) deep, הִרְחִיק to make (it) far, distant, הִיטִיב to make (it) good (with an infinitive without ל Ps. 33, 3, but 1 Sam. 16, 17, in the same combination, with ל); הִשְׁעִיֵּם to do anything early (Ps. 127, 2, along with its opposite אָחַר to do something late, with an infinitive without ל); הִרְבֶּה to make (it) much, הִפְלִא to make (it) wonderful (even with a passive infinitive 2 Chron. 26, 15)³, &c.

¹ In 2 Sam. 14, 19 אֵלֶּשׁ (= אֵלֶּשׁ it is, there is) is used in a similar sense after אֵלֶּשׁ, the negative particle of asseveration, of a truth it is not possible to turn to the right hand or to the left.

² This view is based upon the fact, that in numerous expressions of this kind (see the examples above) the ל may be omitted, and the infinitive consequently stand as an actual accusative of the object (see above, letter c). However, the connexion of the verb with the object is in the latter case closer and more emphatic (hence especially adapted to poetic or prophetic diction), than the looser addition of the infinitive with ל; thus לא אָבָה שְׁמֹעַ Is. 28, 12 is equivalent to they desired not obeying; but לא אָבָה לְשָׁמֹעַ Ezek. 20, 8 rather expresses they could not make up their mind as to hearkening. When connected with ל, the governing verb has a more independent sense than when it directly governs the accusative of the object.

³ In almost all these examples the principal idea is properly contained in the infinitive, whilst the governing verb strictly speaking contains only a subordinate

4. Finally, the infinitive with ל is very frequently used in a much looser connexion to state motives, accompanying circumstances, or otherwise to define more exactly. In English, such infinitive constructions must frequently be turned by *that* or a gerund; e.g. 1 Sam. 12, 17 לְשַׁאֵל לָכֶם מֶלֶךְ *in asking you a king*; 14, 33. Gen. 3, 22. 34, 7. 15. Ex. 23, 2. Lev. 5, 4. 22. 26, 8, 15. Num. 14, 36. 1 Sam. 19, 5. 20, 36. 1 Ki. 2, 3 sq. 14, 8. Ps. 63, 3. 78, 18. 101, 8. 103, 20. 104, 14 sq. 111, 6. Prov. 2, 8. 8, 34. 18, 5. Neh. 13, 18. Sometimes the infinitive with ל is used in this way simply by itself, e.g. 1 Chron. 12, 8 *as the roes upon the mountains* לְמַחֵר (as regards hasting) *in swiftness*; Gen. 2, 3. 2 Sam. 14, 25 (לְהַלֵּל); Is. 21, 1 (לְתַלּוֹחַ); Joel 2, 26. Prov. 2, 2. 26, 2 and so very frequently the infinitive לְאָמַר *dicendo* which has become stereotyped as an adverb to introduce direct narration (in the sense of *thus, as follows*).

5. In a number of instances—especially in the later Books—the infin. constr. with ל appears to be attached by *Wāw* (like the infinitive absolute, § 113. s), as the continuation of a previous finite verb. In most examples of this kind it is, however, evident, that the infinitive with ל virtually depends on an idea of intention, effort, or being in the act of, which, according to the sense, is contained in what has preceded, whilst the copula, as sometimes also elsewhere, is used in an emphatic sense (*and that too*); thus e.g. Ex. 32, 29 (if the text be right) *fill your hand to-day* (sc. with an offering) *for the Lord . . . and that to bring a blessing upon you*, i.e. that ye may be blessed; comp. 1 Sam. 25, 31 (otherwise in verses 26 and 33 where the infinitive absolute is used, see § 113. c); Ps. 104, 21¹. Job 34, 8. Eccles. 9, 1. Neh. 8, 13. 2 Chron. 7, 17.—In Lev. 10, 10 sq. וְלֹא תִכְבְּדוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים might be regarded as an explanatory addition to the command contained in verse 9 b (=this prohibition of wine before the service shall ye observe, and that in order to put a difference, &c.); but probably the text has been disturbed by a redactor.—In 2 Chron. 30, 9 וְלִשְׁכַּח depends on the idea of receiving a favour which lies in לְרַחֵם. On the other hand, in 1 Sam. 8, 12 it is sufficient to explain *and in order to appoint them unto him for captains of thousands* (sc. he will take them). In Is. 44, 28 translate *and he* (Cyrus) *shall perform all my pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, &c.*

adverbial statement, and is therefore best rendered in English by an adverb; e.g. Gen. 27, 20 *how is it that thou hast found it so quickly?* (prop. how thou hast hastened to find!), Gen. 31, 27 *wherefore didst thou flee secretly?* So frequently with הַרְבֵּה (=often, abundantly), Ex. 36, 5. 1 Sam. 1, 12. 2 Ki. 21, 6. Is. 55, 7. Am. 4, 4. Ps. 78, 38, &c.; with שׁוּב (=again), Deut. 30, 9. 1 Ki. 13, 17. Hos. 11, 9. Ezra 9, 14; cf. also 2 Sam. 19, 4. Jer. 1, 12. Jon. 4, 2 and the analogous instances in § 120. g; also 2 Ki. 2, 10 *thou hast asked a hard thing*.

¹ When Delitzsch on Ps. 104, 21, referring to Hab. 1, 17, explains the infinitive with ל as an elliptical mode of expressing the *coniugatio periphrastica* (equivalent to *flagitaturi sunt a deo cibum suum*), this is, in point of fact, certainly true in this and a few other places mentioned above; but all these passages, in which the infinitive with ל follows, are to be distinguished from the cases treated above under letter *h*, where the infinitive with ל without *Wāw* corresponds to a Latin gerundive, or is actually used to express the *coniugatio periphrastica*.

- 9 8. The period of time to which an action or occurrence represented by the infinitive construct belongs, must sometimes be inferred from the context, or the character of the subordinate tenses; comp. e.g. Gen. 2, 4 *these are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, בְּהִבְרָאָם when they were created* (prop. in their being created); Jud. 6, 18 *עַד-בָּאִי וְהִנֵּנִי until I come unto thee, and bring forth, &c.* Cf. 1 Sam. 18, 19 (= *when she should have been given*); 2 Ki. 2, 1. Hos. 7, 1.

- 10 Rem. 1. The constructions of the infinitive with a preposition, described above in letter *d*, are almost always continued in the further course of the narrative by means of the *finite verb*, i. e. by an independent sentence, not by a co-ordinate infinitive. Such a finite verb we regard as governed by a conjunction, which corresponds to the preposition standing before the infinitive. Thus the infinitival construction (frequently even with a change of subject) is continued by a perfect (with לָא), Jer. 9, 12 *because they have forsaken (עַל-עֲוֹנֵיהֶם) my law . . . לֹא שָׁמְעוּ and have not obeyed my voice*; Gen. 39, 10. 1 Sam. 24, 12. Amos 1, 9; without לָא Job 28, 25; by a perfect with וְ (comp. § 112. *i* and *v*) Amos 1, 11 *וְהִנֵּנִי because he did pursue his brother with the sword, וְהִנֵּנִי and did cast off continually all pity* (a frequentative perfect; for examples of the perfect consecutive proper see Gen. 27, 45. Jud. 6, 18. 1 Sam. 10, 8. 2 Ki. 18, 32 [Is. 36, 17], always after לָא (a preposition); Is. 5, 24 (after וְ). 10, 2. 13, 9. 14, 25. 45, 1. 49, 5. 1 Sam. 2, 8. Prov. 2, 8. 5, 2. 8, 21 (always after וְ)¹; by an imperfect consecutive, e.g. Gen. 39, 18 *and it came to pass, וַתִּקַּח אֶת-קוֹלִי וַתִּשָּׁאֵל as I lifted up my voice and cried, that . . .*; 1 Ki. 10, 9. Job 38, 13 (after וְ); 1 Ki. 18, 18. Is. 38, 9. Job 38, 7. 9 sqq. (after וְ); Is. 30, 12. Jer. 7, 13. Ezek. 34, 8 (after וְ).

- 5 The negation of an infinitive construct, on account of the predominance of the noun-element in its character, is effected not by the verbal negative לֹא (except in the compound בְּלֹא, which has come to be used as a preposition, *without*, Num. 35, 23. Prov. 19, 2), but by בְּלֹאִי, originally a substantive (see the Lexicon), with לְ prefixed (comp., however, Num. 14, 16 (מִבְּלֹאִי), e.g. Gen. 3, 11 לְבִלְתִּי לֹא אֶכְלֶםְּ not to eat of it; in a final sense, 4, 15 *lest any finding him should smite him*; only in 2 Ki. 23, 10 is לְ repeated before the infinitive. In Ps. 32, 9 (if the text be right) בְּלֹא negatives, not the infinitive, but the predicate which is understood.

¹ The great frequency of examples of this kind, especially in the poetical Books, is due to a striving after what is called *chiasmus* in the arrangement of the parallel members in the two halves of the verse, i. e. in the instances given, the finite verb at the end of the second (co-ordinate) clause is parallel with the infinitive at the beginning of the first. In this way the verbal form necessarily became separated from the וְ, and consequently the imperfect had to be used instead of the perfect consecutive. Such a parallelism of the *external* and *internal* members of a verse is frequent also in other cases, and was evidently felt to be an elegance of elevated—poetic or prophetic—style.

§ 115. *Construction of the Infinitive Construct with Subject and Object.*

1. Like the infinitive absolute (see § 113. *a*), the character of the infinitive construct as a *verbal noun* is shown by its power of taking the case proper to its verb, and hence in transitive verbs¹ the *accusative of the object*, e.g. Num. 9, 15 אֶת־הַמִּשְׁכָּן בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא *on the day the tabernacle was reared up*; 1 Sam. 19, 1 לְהָמִית אֶת־דָּוִד *that they should slay David*; Gen. 14, 17. 19, 29. Ex. 38, 27. 1 Ki. 12, 15. 15, 4; with a negative, e.g. Lev. 26, 15 לִבְלֹמֶי עֲשׂוֹת אֶת־כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי *so that ye will not do all my commandments*; with the accusative of the personal pronoun, e.g. Deut. 29, 12 לִמְעַן הָקִים־אֹתְךָ *that he may establish thee*; Gen. 25, 26. Jer. 24, 7; with a verbal suffix, e.g. Ex. 2, 14 לְהַרְגֵנִי *to kill me*; Jer. 38, 26 לְבִלְמִי הוֹשִׁיבֵנִי *that he would not cause me to return* (on the suffix, cf. letter *c*). In Is. 49, 6 the object even precedes the infinitive with ל; on this order cf. the note on § 114. *r*.—If the verb governs a double accusative, the infinitive may also take the same, e.g. Gen. 41, 39 אֲחֵרֵי הוֹדִיעַ אֱלֹהִים אֹתְךָ *forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this*; Deut. 21, 16.

Rem. 1. The object after the infinitive construct must also always be regarded as in the accusative, even when it is not expressly introduced (as in all the above examples), by the *nota accusativi* אֶת, and when therefore the substantive in question might easily be taken as the *genitive of the object* governed by the infinitive (the usual construction in Arabic), e.g. Prov. 21, 15 עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט *to do judgement*. Against regarding it as a genitive, which is in itself possible, (*the doing, the executing of judgement*), is the fact (*a*) that elsewhere the *nota accusativi* is so frequently added; (*b*) that in such a case the secondary forms of the infinitive, such as רִאֵה for רָאָה (פָּנִיךָ) Gen. 48, 11 (comp. Ps. 101, 3. Prov. 16, 16), would be unintelligible; (*c*) that certain infinitive forms, if they were to be regarded as in the construct state, could hardly retain the pretonic Qameṣ without exception, whereas, when connected with suffixes (i.e. with real genitives; comp. § 33. *c*), this Qameṣ necessarily becomes vocal *Ṣad*; e.g. Gen. 18, 25 לְהָמִית צַדִּיק *to slay the righteous* (never as לְהָמִית; comp., on the other hand, above, הוֹשִׁיבֵנִי); 2 Ki. 21, 8. Ezek. 44, 30. Similarly in such cases as Is. 3, 13 (Ps. 50, 4) instead of לְרִין עַמִּים we should rather expect לְרִין, if the infinitive were regarded as in the construct state, and עַמִּים as the genitive. Hence also in cases like Is. 58, 9 (שָׁלַח for שְׁלַח) we must assume, with Sellin, op. cit., p. 78, a merely 'external phonetic connexion' and not the genitive construction.

2. The verbal suffixes added to the infinitive are (with the exception of לְהוֹצִיאָה Jer. 39, 14) only the suffix of the 1st pers. sing. (besides the above examples comp. also 1 Sam. 5, 10. 27, 1. 28, 9. Ruth 2, 10. 1 Chron. 12, 17, &c.) and plural; e.g. לְהַשְׁמִידֵנוּ *to destroy us*, Deut. 1, 27 (immediately after אָתָּנָה, so that

¹ For examples of the accus. of the object with a pass. infin., see § 121. *c*.

נִּי is doubtless a *verbal* not a *noun-suffix*, although in form it might be either); לְחַמְּתֵנוּ Num. 16, 13. Jud. 13, 23 (after חָסֵץ). Elsewhere the pronominal object is appended either by means of the accusative sign (e.g. Gen. 25, 26 בְּלֶדֶת אֹתָם prop. *in the bearing them*; לָרַעַת אֹתִי *to know me*, Jer. 24, 7) or in the form of a *noun-suffix* (as genitive of the object). The latter occurs almost always, whenever the context excludes the possibility of a misunderstanding; e.g. 1 Sam. 20, 33 לְחַתְּרוֹ (prop. *for his smiting*) *to smile him*, not, as the form might also mean, *in order that he might smile*; comp. 1 Ki. 20, 35; with the suffix of the 3rd sing. fem. Num. 22, 25; of the 3rd plur. Jos. 10, 20. 2 Sam. 21, 2, &c. Hence also the suffixes of the 2nd sing. with the infinitive, as לְהַכְתִּיךָ Jer. 40, 14, comp. Mic. 6, 13, and even גָּדַלְךָ *to magnify thee*, Jos. 3, 7, must certainly be regarded as *nominal* not *verbal* suffixes. The connexion of the noun-suffix, as genitive of the object, with the infinitive was so fully established, that it could be used not only in such strange cases, as Gen. 37, 4 יָכְלוּ דַבָּרַי לְשָׁלֹם *they could not speak to him peaceably*, comp. Zech. 3, 1 לְשֹׁמְנִי *to be an adversary to him*, but ultimately even in the 1st sing., as in Num. 22, 13 לְחַתִּי *to give me leave*, [Deut. 25, 7 לֹא אֶבְי אֶתְּךָ יְבִמִי *he will not perform the duty of a husband's brother unto me*; 1 Chron. 4, 10 לְבִלְתִּי עֲצֹבִי *that it may not grieve me*!]

- d 3. The power of governing like a verb is also retained in those verbal nouns which, although originally secondary forms of the infinitive, have fully acquired the value of nouns, e.g. Is. 11, 9 דַּעַת אֶת־יְהוָה (prop. *to know the Lord*) *the knowledge of the Lord*; לִירְאוֹת אֹתִי *to fear me*, Deut. 4, 10. 5, 26. 10, 12; an accusative follows לְאַהֲבָה Deut. 10, 12. 15. Is. 56, 6 (comp. also Hos. 3, 1); לְחַנּוּפָה Is. 30, 28; בְּשִׂנְאוֹת יְהוָה אֹתָנוּ Deut. 1, 27; after verbal nouns formed by prefixing כֹּ (comp. § 45. e), Num. 10, 2. Is. 13, 19. Amos 4, 11. Ezek. 17, 9. The accusative of the object likewise remains after infinitives (or their secondary forms) which have the article, e.g. Gen. 2, 9. Jer. 22, 16, or a suffix, e.g. Gen. 5, 4, &c., 28, 4. 6. 29, 19 sq. 30, 15. 38, 5. 2 Sam. 3, 11. Is. 29, 13.

- e 2. The subject of the action represented by the infinitive is mostly placed immediately¹ after it, either in the *genitive* or *nominative*. The subject is in the genitive (§ 33. c) whenever it has the form of a noun-suffix, and when the infinitive has the termination of the constr. st. fem. sing. (see letter *f*); probably also in many other cases, where the infinitive in form and meaning is used more like a substantive, and accordingly governs like a noun. On the other hand, the subject of the infinitive is certainly to be regarded as a *nominative*, when it is separated from the infinitive by any insertion, and according

¹ In Gen. 24, 30 the subject of בָּרָאת is wanting (but נִשְׁכַּח follows); the original reading was undoubtedly בָּרָאתוֹ, and the text is now in a state of confusion; verse 30 a should come before verse 29 b. In Gen. 25, 26. Ex. 9, 16. 1 Sam. 18, 19. Ps. 42, 4 the subject, although not indicated, is easily supplied from the context. The infinitive in such cases is best rendered in English by a passive.

to certain indications (see letter *g*) very probably also in many other instances.

Rem. 1. Examples of genitives of the subject after infinitives in the connective form, are Deut. 1, 27 אֲהָנִי יְהוָה אֲהָנִי prop. *in the Lord's hating us*; comp. 7, 8. Gen. 19, 16. 1 Ki. 10, 9. Is. 13, 19. 47, 9. Hos. 3, 1. Am. 4, 11. The subject of the infinitive is probably also to be regarded as genitive in such cases as Ex. 17, 1 *and there was no water* הָיָה מַיִם לְשָׁתֹת הָעָם *for the people to drink* (prop. for the drinking of the people), and in cases like Gen. 16, 16 (פְּלֶדֶת הָנֶר) Gen. 16, 3. Ex. 19, 1. Num. 20, 3. 4. 33, 38. 1 Ki. 6, 1. Ps. 133, 1. 2 Chron. 7, 3, &c.

2. Examples in which the subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion, and hence must certainly be regarded as a nominative, are Job 34, 22 לְהַסְתֵּר שָׁם לְהַסְתֵּר שָׁם פְּעָלֵי אֵן *that the workers of iniquity may hide themselves there* (prop. for the hiding themselves there the workers of iniquity); cf. Gen. 34, 15. Num. 35, 6. Deut. 19, 3. Jud. 9, 2. 2 Sam. 24, 13. Ps. 76, 10, and below, letter *i*. The subject is likewise to be regarded as a *nominative*, whenever the *Lamedk* is prefixed to the infinitive by means of a pretonic Qameṣ (comp. letter *b* above), e.g. 2 Sam. 19, 20 לְשֹׂם הַפֶּלֶא *אֶל-לְבֹ*, since, if the infinitive were used as a *nomen regens*, we should rather expect לְשֹׂם according to § 102. *f*. That the subject of the infinitive is regarded elsewhere also as nominative, is again (see above, letter *b*) probable, since in such forms as הָיָה Deut. 25, 19. Is. 14, 3, הָיָה Ps. 46, 3, &c. the pretonic Qameṣ is retained without exception, whereas on the analogy of הָיָה Ezek. 24, 13, הָיָה Jer. 23, 20, &c., we should expect הָיָה, הָיָה, &c., if the infinitive were regarded as a *nomen regens*. Or was the retention of the Qameṣ (assuming the thorough correctness of the Masoretic punctuation) rendered possible even before a following genitive, because that vowel was characteristic of the form? It is at all events certain that owing to the lack of case-endings¹, a distinction between the genitival and nominatival constructions could not have been consciously made in the case of most infinitives, e.g. in unchangeable forms like קָטַל, קָטַל, &c.

3. When both a *subject* and an *object* are connected with the infinitive, the rule is, that the subject should immediately follow the infinitive, and then the object. The latter, in such a case, is necessarily in the accusative, but the subject (as in letter *e*) may be either in the genitive or in the nominative. The noun-suffixes again are, of course, to be regarded as genitives, e.g. Gen. 39, 18 לִי כַּהֲרִימִי קוֹלִי *as I lifted up my voice* (comp. 1 Ki. 13, 21, and the examples, Gen. 5, 4, &c., enumerated above, under letter *d*), and so also substantives which follow a connective form, Deut. 1, 27, &c.; see above, letters *d* and *f*.

¹ In Arabic, where the case-endings leave no doubt as to the construction, it is equally possible to say either *qatlu Zaidin* (gen. of subj.) 'Amran (acc.), literally *Zaid's killing 'Amr*, or *qatlu 'Amrin* (gen. of obj.) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.), or even *el-qatlu* (with article) *Zaidun* (nom. of subj.) 'Amran (acc. of obj.).

i On the other hand, the subject appears necessarily to be in the nominative in such cases as Is. 10, 15 *אֶת־מִרְיָיו שֹׁבֵם כְּהִנִּיף* as if a rod should shake them that lift it up (for the plur. מִרְיָיו comp. § 124. *k*), not כְּהִנִּיף, as would be expected (see letter *g* above), if שֹׁבֵם were in the genitive; comp. Job 33, 17. And so probably also in other cases, as Gen. 5, 1. 13, 10. Jos. 14, 7. 1 Ki. 13, 4. 2 Ki. 23, 10. Is. 32, 7. The subject is separated from the infinitive by an insertion (and consequently must necessarily be in the nominative; see letter *g* above), e. g. in Jer. 21, 1.

k Rem. Less frequently the object is placed immediately after the infinitive, and then the nominative of the subject, as a subsequent complement, e. g. Is. 20, 1 *בְּשִׁלַּח אֹתוֹ סָרְגֹן* when Sargon sent him; Gen. 4, 15. Jos. 14, 11. 2 Sam. 18, 29. Is. 5, 24. Ps. 56, 1. Prov. 25, 8. In Num. 24, 23 the subject follows an infinitive which has a noun-suffix in place of the object.

§ 116. The Participles.

Cf. Sellin (see above at the head of § 113), p. 6 sqq., and Kahan, p. 11 sqq.

a 1. Like the two infinitives, the participles also occupy a middle place between the noun and the verb. In form they are simple nouns, and most nearly related to the adjective; consequently they cannot in themselves be employed to represent definite relations of tense or mood. On the other hand, their verbal character is shown by their not representing, like the adjectives, a fixed and permanent quality (or condition), but one which is in some way connected with an action or activity. The participle active indicates a person or thing conceived as being in the continual uninterrupted exercise of an activity. The participle passive, on the other hand, indicates the person or thing in a condition which has been brought about by external actions.

b Rem. That the language was fully conscious of the difference between a state implying action (or effected by external action) and a mere passive condition, is seen from the fact, that participles proper cannot be formed from the simple stative Qal, but only verbal adjectives of the form *qāṭēl* (מַטֵּל, מַכֵּה, &c.) or *qāṭōl* (מַטֵּל, &c.), whereas the transitive Qal שֹׂנֵא *to hate*, although it coincides in form with the intransitive Qal (as a verb middle *E*), nevertheless forms a participle active שֹׂנֵא, and participle passive שְׁנוּא (comp. the feminine שְׁנוּאָה).—In cases where the participle proper and the verbal adjective both occur, they are by no means synonymous. When the Assyrians are called in Is. 28, 11 *לְעֵי שֹׁפָה* men of stammering lips, a character is ascribed to them which is inseparably connected with their personality. On the other hand *לֵי פֶלֶה* Jer. 20, 7, describes those about the prophet as continually engaged in throwing ridicule upon him. Cf. also Ps. 9, 18 (שֹׁכְחִי) with 50, 22 (שֹׁכְחִי).

On the difference between the participle as expressing *simple* duration and the imperfect as expressing *progressive* duration, comp. what has been stated above in § 107. *d.* Nevertheless the participle is sometimes used—especially in the later Books, comp. e.g. Neh. 6, 17. 2 Chron. 17, 11—where we should expect the action to be divided up into its several parts, and consequently should expect the finite verb. But the substitution of the participle for the *tempus historicum*, which becomes customary in Aramaic (comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 76. 2. *d* and *e*), is nevertheless quite foreign to Hebrew.

2. The period of time indicated by (*a*) a participle active, either *d* as an attribute or predicate, must be inferred from the particular context. Thus מֵת may mean either *morians* (Zech. 11, 9), or *mortuus* (so commonly; with the article הַמֵּת regularly = *the dead man*), or *moriturus* (Deut. 4, 22); בָּא *coming, come* Gen. 18, 11 and elsewhere, *venturus* 1 Sam. 2, 31 and elsewhere; נָפַל *'falling, but also 'fallen, ready to fall* (threatening ruin, Is. 30, 13. Amos 9, 11). For other examples of perfect participles see Gen. 27, 33. 43, 18 (הָשֵׁב *that was returned*; comp. Ezra 6, 21 and elsewhere, הֹשְׁבִים *which were come again out of captivity*); Gen. 35, 3. Ex. 11, 5. Zech. 12, 1. Ps. 137, 7. Prov. 8, 9. Job 12, 4 (כָּרָא), and letter *m* below. For future participles see Gen. 41, 25. 1 Ki. 18, 9. Is. 5, 5. Jon. 1, 3, &c., probably also לִקְחִי Gen. 19, 14. On the *futurum instans* (esp. after הֵנָּה) see letter *p* below.

(*b*) Of the passive participles, the participle *Qal* (e.g. כְּתוּב *scriptus*) always corresponds to a Latin or Greek perfect participle passive, those of the other conjugations, especially *Niphtal*, sometimes to a Latin gerundive (or to an adjective in *-bilis*), e.g. מֵרָא *metuendus, to be feared*, Ps. 76, 8 and elsewhere; נִחְסַד *desiderandus (desiderabilis)* Gen. 3, 6. Ps. 19, 11, &c.; נִבְרָא *creandus* Ps. 102, 19; נִלָּד, usually *natus*, but also (like הִיֵּלַד Jud. 13, 8) *procreandus, nasciturus* 1 Ki. 13, 2. Ps. 22, 32; נִרְעַץ *terribilis* Ps. 89, 8; נִחְשֵׁב *abominable* Job 15, 16; נִחְשָׁב *aestimandus* Is. 2, 22; הִנְאָכֵלֶת *that may be eaten* (an animal) Lev. 11, 47. In *Pu'al*, מְהֻלָּל *laudandus, who is worthy to be praised* Ps. 18, 4. In *Hoph'al*, 2 Sam. 20, 1 מְשֻׁלָּח; 1 Sam. 19, 11. 2 Ki. 11, 2 הַמְּשֻׁחָּתִים; Is. 12, 5 מְרֻעָה.

¹ Such examples as נִרְעַץ, נִחְסַד, מְהֻלָּל show plainly the origin of this gerundive use of the participle passive. A person or thing *feared, desired, or praised* at all times, is shown thereby to be *terrible, desirable, or praiseworthy*, and therefore also *to be feared, &c.* From such examples this use then appears to have been extended to other cases.

- f* 3. The participles active, in virtue of their partly verbal character, possess the power of governing like verbs, and consequently, when used in the absolute state, may take after them an object either in the accusative, or with the preposition with which the verb in question is elsewhere usually construed, e.g. 1 Sam. 18, 29 אֵיב אֶת־דָּוִד prop. *one hating David*; Gen. 42, 29; with the suffix of the accusative, e.g. עָשִׂי עִשְׂי *that made me* Job 31, 15; כִּי רִאֵנוּ *who seeth us?* Is. 29, 15 (in Is. 47, 10 רִאֵנִי is abnormal); רָדִים *ruling them* Ps. 68, 28 (also with the article, e.g. 2 Sam. 22, 33 [= Ps. 18, 33] הַמֵּאַרְגֵּנִי *that girdeth me*, LXX δ *κατασῶν με*); Deut. 20, 1. 2 Sam. 1, 24. Is. 9, 12. 63, 11. Ps. 103, 4. 1 Ki. 9, 23 בָּעֵם הָרִדִים *which bare rule over the people*; 2 Ki. 20, 5 לִךְ הִנְנִי רֹפֵא *behold, I will heal thee*¹.

By an exhaustive examination of the statistics, Sellin (see the title at the head of § 113), p. 40 sqq., shows that the participle when construed as a *verb* expresses a single and comparatively transitory act, or relates to particular cases, historical facts, and the like, while the participle construed as a *noun* (see letter *g*) indicates repeated, enduring, or commonly occurring acts, occupations, and thoughts.

So also the verbal adjectives of the form *qāfēl* may take an accusative of the person or thing, if the finite verb from which they are derived governs an accusative, e.g. Deut. 34, 9 מְלֵא רוּחַ *full of the spirit*; 1 Ki. 9, 23; Ps. 5, 5 רֹשֵׁעַ חֵפֶץ *that hath pleasure in wickedness*.

- g* As a sort of noun the participle may, however, also exercise the same government as a noun, being in the construct state, and followed by the object of the action in the genitive (see § 89. *a*; comp. also § 128. *x*), e.g. Ps. 5, 12 אֲהַבֵּי שְׁמִי *that love thy name*; comp. Ps. 19, 8 sq.; also when a verbal adjective, e.g. Gen. 22, 12 יִרָא אֱלֹהִים *one fearing God*, and Hab. 2, 15; with an infinitive, Ps. 127, 2; with a noun-suffix (which, according to § 33. *c*, also represents a genitive), e.g. Gen. 4, 14 כִּלְ-מַצְאִי *whosoever findeth me* (prop. my finder; comp. עָשִׂי *my maker*); 12, 3 מְבָרְכֶיךָ *that bless thee*, מְסַלְלֶיךָ *that curseth thee*; 27, 29. 1 Sam. 2, 30. Is. 63, 13. Jer. 33, 2. Ps. 18, 49².

¹ On the other hand, in Is. 11, 9 לִיָּם מְכַסִּים *covering the sea*, the ל serves only to introduce the object preceding the participle; [cf. the Arabic parallels cited by Driver, *Tensas*, § 135, 7 *Obs.*] Comp. Hab. 2, 14.

² When, as in Job 40, 19, the participle with the noun-suffix הַעֲשֵׂה *he that made him*, also has the article (comp. § 127. *i*), the anomaly is difficult to understand, since a word determined by a genitive does not admit of being determined

Rem. To the class of objective genitives belong also specifications of place after the participles *בָּא* *iniciens* and *יֵצֵא* *egrediens*, since the verbs *בָּא* and *יֵצֵא*, in the sense of *ingredi*, *egredi*, can be directly connected with an accusative; e.g. Gen. 23, 10. 18 *בָּא יָשַׁע עִירָה* *that went in at the gate of his city*; Lam. 1, 4; after *יֵצֵא* Gen. 9, 10. 34. 24. 46, 26, and elsewhere.—In poetic language the participle in the construct state may be connected not only with a genitive of the object, but also with any other specifications (especially of space) which otherwise can only be made to depend on the verb in question by means of a preposition; comp. Is. 38, 18, and frequently, *יֵרְדוּ-בֹר* *they that go down into the pit* (the grave); Ps. 88, 6 *שָׁכְבִי קֶבֶר* *that lie in the grave*; Deut. 32, 24 (Mic. 7, 17); 1 Ki. 2, 7. 2 Ki. 11, 5. 7. 9 *those that came in* (or *went out*) *on the sabbath*, Prov. 2, 7. 1 Chron. 5, 18, and elsewhere; instead of the construction with *מִן*, e.g. Is. 59, 20 (*those who turn from transgression*). Mic. 2, 8.

These genitives of nearer definition appear also in the form of a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps. 18, 40. 49 *קָמִי עָלַי* (*קָמִים* *עָלַי*) *that rise up against me*; comp. Ex. 15, 7. 32, 25. Deut. 33, 11. Ps. 44, 6. 53, 6 (*חֲנֹף*); 102, 9. Prov. 2, 19 *כָּל-בָּאֶיהָ* *all that go unto her*; the construction is especially bold in Is. 29, 7 *כָּל-צִבְיָהּ וְכָל-מְצֻדָתֶיהָ* *all that fight against her and her stronghold* (for *עָלֶיהָ וְעַל-מִצְדָּתֶיהָ*).—In Is. 1, 30 *אֶלֶף נָבִלַת עָלֶיהָ* *fading as regards its leaf*, it remains doubtful whether *נָבִלַת* is in the absolute state, and consequently *עָלֶיהָ* in the accusative, or whether it is to be regarded as construct state, and *עָלֶיהָ* as the genitive. In the latter case it would be analogous to Prov. 14, 2 (see letter *h*).

4. The passive participles also may either be in the absolute state, and take the determining word in the accusative¹, or may be connected with it in the construct state, e.g. Jud. 18, 11. 1 Sam. 2, 18. Ezek. 9, 2 *לְבִישׁ פְּדִים* *clothed in linen*, comp. verse 3 *הַלְבִּישׁ הַפְּדִים*; (even with a suffix *קָרַע בְּתֻנְתּוֹ* *rent as regards his coat* 2 Sam. 15, 32; with the participle following in Jud. 1, 7); but Ezek. 9, 11 *לְבִישׁ הַפְּדִים* *the one clothed with linen*; 2 Sam. 13, 31 *קָרַע בְּגָדָיו* *rent in respect of clothes*,

by the article.—No less remarkable is the use of the constr. st. of the participle before the accusative in Jer. 33, 22 *מִשְׁרָתִי אֲתִי* *that minister unto me* (for which there is *מִשְׁרָתִי* in verse 21) and Amos 4, 13 where an accusative of the product follows the genitive of the object, *עֲשֵׂה שֶׁחֹר עֵינֶיךָ* *maker of the morning into darkness*. In Jer. 2, 17 *בָּעֵת מוֹלֶכְךָ* is supposed to mean *at the time when he led thee*; perhaps the perfect (*הוֹלֵךְ*) should be read as in 6, 15. In Ezek. 27, 34, the ancient versions read *נִשְׁבְּרָתָהּ עַתָּה* *now thou art broken*, instead of the difficult *עַתָּה נִשְׁבְּרָתָהּ*. In 1 Ki. 20, 40 read *עֲשֵׂה* before *הָהָה וְהָהָה*.

¹ On the proper force of this accusative when retained in the passive construction comp. below, § 117. cc, &c., and § 121. c. So also Neh. 4, 12 is to be understood, *and the builders were girded every one with his sword on his side, and building*.

equivalent to *with their clothes rent* (comp. Jer. 41, 5); Num. 24, 4. Deut. 25, 10. Is. 3, 3. 33, 24. Joel 1, 8. Ps. 32, 1 (נְשָׁחַטְתָּ נְשָׁחַטְתָּ *forgiven in respect of transgression*, כִּסְיוֹ חַטָּאת *covered in respect of sin*); with a suffix to the noun, Prov. 14, 2 נָלֹחַ דְּרָכָיו *he that is perverse in his ways*.

- l Rem. The passive participle occurs in the construct state before a genitive of the *cause*, e.g. in Is. 1, 7 שְׂרֵפֹת אֵשׁ *burnt with fire*; comp. Gen. 41, 6. Ex. 28, 11. Deut. 32, 24; before a genitive denoting the *author*, e.g. Gen. 24, 31 בְּרֵךְ ה' *blessed of the Lord* (but Ps. 115, 15 לְיְהוָה *see* § 121. f); comp. Is. 53, 4. Ps. 22, 7. Job 14, 1 (15, 14. 25, 4); hence also with noun-suffixes (which are accordingly genitive) Prov. 9, 18 טָרְאוּהָ *her invited ones*, i.e. those invited by her; comp. 7, 26. Ps. 37, 22.

m 5. The use of the participle as predicate is very frequent in noun-clauses (which, according to § 140. e, describe established facts and conditions), in which the period of time intended by the description must again (see above, letter d) be inferred from the context. Thus:

- n (a) As *present*, in speaking of truths which hold good at all times, e.g. Eccles. 1, 4 בָּא דֹר וְדֹר הָלֵךְ וְדֹר הָלֵךְ *one generation goeth, and another generation cometh*; and the earth abideth (עֹלָמְדָה) *for ever*; comp. verse 7; also to represent incidental (continuous) occurrences which are just happening, Gen. 3, 5. 16, 8 (*I am fleeing*); 32, 12. Ex. 9, 17. 1 Sam. 16, 15. 23, 1. 2 Ki. 7, 9. Is. 1, 7; also when the subject is introduced by the emphatic demonstrative הִנֵּה *behold!* (§ 100. e and § 105. b), e.g. Gen. 16, 11 הִנֵּה הָרָה *behold, thou art with child*, &c.; 27, 42; frequently also in circumstantial clauses (connected by *Wāw*), comp. § 141. e, e.g. Gen. 15, 2, and elsewhere.

- o (b) To represent *past* actions or states, sometimes in independent noun-clauses, e.g. Ex. 20, 18 וְכָל-הָעָם רָאוּ אֶת-הַקּוֹלֹת *and all the people saw the thunders*, &c.; 1 Ki. 1, 5; in negative statements, e.g. Gen. 39, 23 a; sometimes in relative clauses, e.g. Gen. 39, 23 b. Deut. 3, 2, (comp. also the frequent combination of the participle with the article as the equivalent of a relative clause, e.g. Gen. 32, 10 הַאִמֶּר *which saidst*; 12, 7. 16, 13. 35, 1. 3. 36, 35. 48, 16. 2 Sam. 15, 31, &c.); sometimes again (see letter n) in *circumstantial* clauses, especially those representing actions or states which occurred simultaneously with other past actions, &c., e.g. Gen. 19, 1 *and the two angels came to Sodom* וְלוֹט יָשָׁב *and Lot sat*, &c.; 18, 1. 8. 16. 22. 25, 26. Jud. 13, 9. 2 Chron. 22, 9; also with the subject introduced by הִנֵּה Gen. 37, 7. 41, 17. (On הָלֵךְ with a following adjective or participle to express an action constantly or occasionally recurring, cf. § 113. u.)

- p (c) To announce *future* actions or events, e.g. 1 Ki. 2, 2. 2 Ki. 4, 16, *at this season when the time cometh round*, הִנֵּה אָתָּה תִּבְרֵךְ בֶּן *thou shalt embrace a son*; so after a specification of time, Gen. 7, 4. 15, 14. 17, 19. 19, 13. Is. 23, 15 (where, however, after וְהָיָה we should rather expect a perfect consecutive; Qimhi therefore explains וְהָיָה as the 3rd sing. fem. of the perfect), Hag. 2, 6; or in relative clauses, Gen. 41, 25. Is. 5, 5 *what I am doing*, i.e. am in the act of doing; in a deliberative question, Gen. 37, 30; but especially often when the subject

is introduced by הֵנָּה (especially also if the subject be attached as a suffix to הֵנָּה as הֵנָּה, הֵנָּה, &c.), if it is intended to announce the event as imminent, or at least near at hand (and sure to happen), when it is called *futurum instans*, e. g. Gen. 6, 17. 15, 3. 20, 3. 24, 13 sq. 48, 21. 50, 5. Ex. 3, 13. 8, 25. 9, 3. 34, 10. Jos. 2, 18. Jud. 7, 17. 9, 33. 1 Sam. 3, 11. 2 Ki. 7, 2. Is. 3, 1. 7, 14. 17, 1. Jer. 30, 10. Zech. 2, 13. 3, 8; with a participle passive, 2 Sam. 20, 21: comp. also § 112. f.

Rem. 1. As the above examples show, a noun-clause with a participle as *q* predicate may have for its subject either a substantive or a personal pronoun; in both cases the participle, especially if there be a certain emphasis upon it, may precede the subject. Also in noun-clauses introduced by הֵנָּה the subject may be either a substantive, or (e. g. Gen. 37, 7) a separate personal pronoun, or a suffix attached to הֵנָּה. In the same way, the subject may also be introduced by *est*, see the Lexicon) with a suffix, and in negative sentences by *non est* (אין) with a suffix, e. g. Jud. 6, 36 אִם-יִשְׁעָךְ כֹּחַשֵׁן if thou wilt save; Gen. 43, 5 אִם-יִשְׁלַח if thou wilt not send; 1 Sam. 19, 11.—In such cases as Is. 14, 27 יָדוֹ הַנְּטוּיָה the stretched out hand is his, הַנְּטוּיָה is not, like נְטוּיָה in 9, 11. 16, &c., the predicate (in which case the participle could not take the article), but the subject; comp. Gen. 2, 11. 45, 12. Is. 66, 9. Ezek. 20, 29. Zech. 7, 6 (cf. § 126. k), where the participle with the article likewise refers to the present, also Num. 7, 2. Deut. 3, 21. 4, 3, &c., and 1 Sam. 4, 16, where it refers to the past. In 1 Ki. 12, 8 and 21, 11 even in relative clauses after אֲשֶׁר.

2. To give express emphasis to an action continuing in the *past*, the perfect הָיָה *r* in the corresponding person is sometimes added to the participle, and similarly the imperfect הָיָה (or the jussive הָיִה, or the imperfect consecutive) is used to emphasize an action continuing in the *future*, e. g. Job 1, 14 הַבָּקָר הָיָה חֹרְשׁוֹת the oxen (cows) were plowing; Gen. 37, 2. 39, 22. Ex. 3, 1. Deut. 9, 24. Jud. 1, 7. 1 Sam. 2, 11. 2 Sam. 3, 6; the same occurs with a passive participle, e. g. Jos. 5, 5. Zech. 3, 3; יָהִיָּה with a participle is found e. g. in Is. 2, 2; the jussive in Gen. 1, 6. Ps. 109, 12¹; and יִהְיֶה with a participle in Jud. 16, 21. Neh. 1, 4.

3. The *personal pronoun* which would be expected as the subject of a participial *s* clause is frequently omitted, or at least (as elsewhere in noun-clauses, comp. Is. 26, 3. Ps. 16, 8. Job 9, 32) the pronoun of the 3rd pers. הוּא, e. g. Gen. 24, 30. 37, 15. 38, 24. 41, 1. 1 Sam. 10, 11. 15, 12. Is. 29, 8 (the participle always after הֵנָּה); comp., moreover, Gen. 32, 7. Deut. 33, 3. 1 Sam. 17, 25. 20, 1. Is. 33, 5. 40, 19. Ps. 22, 29. 33, 5. 55, 20. Job 12, 17. 19 sqq. 25, 2. 26, 7; הוּא is omitted in Lev. 18, 28; הָיָה in 1 Ki. 5, 1. Is. 32, 12. Ezek. 8, 12. Neh. 9, 3; in a relative clause, Gen. 39, 22. Is. 24, 2.—The personal pronoun of the 2nd pers. masc. (אַתָּה) is omitted in Hab. 2, 10; the 2nd fem. (אַתְּ) in Gen. 20, 16 (where, however, for the participle נִכְחַת the 2nd fem. perf. is really intended); the pronoun of the 1st sing. in Hab. 1, 5. Zech. 9, 12. Mal. 2, 16; the 2nd plur. (אַתֶּם) 1 Sam. 2, 24 (if the text be right), 6, 3. Ezek. 13, 7 (f).

¹ A jussive is practically to be supplied also in the formulae of blessing and cursing, בָּרַךְ blessed be . . . Gen. 9, 26 and elsewhere; אָרַר cursed art thou . . . 3, 14 and elsewhere.

- 1' Of a different kind are the cases in which some undefined subject is to be supplied with the participle; e.g. Is. 21, 11 *קָרָא אֵלַי* *there is one calling unto me* (= one calleth; § 144. d); comp. Is. 30, 24. 33, 4.—So with participles in the plur., e.g. Ex. 5, 16 *אֲמָרִים* sc. the taskmasters; Jer. 33, 5. 38, 23. Ezek. 13, 7 (?). 36, 13. 37, 11 (equivalent to *sunt qui dicant*).
- 11 4. We must mention as a special class those noun-clauses which occur at the beginning of a period, and are intended to lay stress upon the fact that the first action still continues on the occurrence of the second (always introduced by וְ); e.g. Gen. 29, 9. Job 1, 16 sq. *בָּא מְדַבֵּר וְהָא עוֹד* *he was yet speaking, and* (= *when*) *another came*, &c.¹; comp. 1 Sam. 9, 11. 27. 30, 36. 1 Ki. 14, 17 *she was entering the threshold of the house, when the child died*; 2 Ki. 2, 23. 4, 5. Dan. 9, 20 sq.; also in Jud. 19, 22. 1 Sam. 9, 14. 17, 23. 1 Ki. 1, 42. Job 1, 18 sq., in all which passages the apodosis is introduced by וְהָא.—On the other hand, in 1 Ki. 1, 14 the noun-clause itself is introduced by וְהָא (as in verse 22 by וְהָא), and denotes an action only just impending². Finally, when the whole sentence is introduced by means of וְהָא (comp. § 111. g), and the apodosis by וְהָא, Gen. 42, 35. 2 Ki. 2, 11. 13, 21; without וְהָא in the apodosis, 1 Sam. 7, 10. 2 Ki. 19, 37 (Is. 37, 38).
- 1' *Participles active*, which are used in the sense of the perfect participle, and also *participles passive*, in accordance with their meaning, express in such noun-clauses a state still continuing on the occurrence of the principal action, e.g. Gen. 38, 25 *שְׁלָחָה וְהָא מְבִיאָתָא* *she was being brought forth, when she sent*, &c.; comp. Gen. 50, 24; [see further in Driver, *Tenses*, §§ 166-169.]
- 12 5. Different from the examples treated in letters *u* and *v* are the instances in which a participle (either alone or as the attribute of a noun) stands at the beginning of the sentence as a *casus pendens* (or as the subject of a *compound noun-clause*, see § 143. c) to indicate a condition, the contingent occurrence of which involves a further consequence; e.g. Gen. 9, 6 *הָאֲדָם בָּאָדָם* *shedding man's blood*, i.e. if any one sheddeth man's blood, *by man shall his blood be shed*; Ex. 21, 12. Ps. 75, 4. Prov. 17, 14. Job 41, 18; so especially if כָּל-*every* precedes the participle, Gen. 4, 15. 1 Sam. 3, 11 (2 Ki. 21, 12). The apodosis is generally introduced by וְ (*wāw apodosis*), e.g. Ex. 12, 15 (with a following perfect consecutive), Num. 35, 30; 1 Sam. 2, 13 *בָּרַח וְהָא* *when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servant came*, &c.; 2 Sam. 14, 10 (participle with article); 22, 41 (where, however, the text is to be emended in accordance with Ps. 18, 41); 2 Sam. 23, 3 sq. Prov. 23, 24 *Kth*;

¹ The independent noun-clause here lays stress upon the simultaneous occurrence (and consequently the overlapping) of the events far more forcibly than could be done by a subordinate expression of time (as e.g. וְהָא בְּרַבְרָא). In English it may be represented by *scarcely had he finished speaking when* . . . As the above examples show, the apodosis also frequently consists of a noun-clause.

² At the same time the preceding עוֹד *still* shows that what is announced is not merely a future event, but a future event *contemporaneous* with something else; the case thus entirely differs from the examples given in § 112. 1, where וְהָא refers to the following participle, while here it belongs properly to the apodosis, before which it is therefore generally placed; see the examples.

29, 9.—As in the instances discussed under letter *u*, such sentences are sometimes preceded by וַיְהִי, comp. 1 Sam. 10, 11. 11, 11. 2 Sam. 2, 23 וַיְהִי כַּל־הַפָּא *and it came to pass, that as many as came, &c.*—On the other hand, וַהֲשִׁיבָרְתָּ Dan. 8, 22 is a mere catchword (equivalent to *and as for that which was broken*) to call to mind the contents of verse 8.

6. On the use of the participle after the infinitive absolute וְהָלַךְ comp. § 113. *u*.

7. Almost as a rule the participial construction beginning a sentence (like the *x* infinitival construction according to § 114. *r*) is continued by means of a finite verb with or without ׀, before which the English construction requires us to supply the relative pronoun implied in the participle; thus, continued by means of a perfect, Is. 14, 17 הָרַם וְעָרָיו הָרַם שָׁם הִבֵּל פְּפוּדָּר וְעָרָיו הָרַם *that made the world as a wilderness, and overthrew the cities thereof*¹; 43, 7. Ezek. 22, 3. Ps. 136, 13 sqq. Prov. 2, 17; by a perfect without *Wāw*, Gen. 49, 11; by a simple imperfect (as the *modus rei repetitae* in the present), Is. 5, 23. 46, 6. Prov. 7, 8. Job 12, 17. 19 sqq. 24, 21; by an imperfect without *Wāw*, e. g. 1 Sam. 2, 8. Is. 5, 8. Prov. 2, 14. 19, 26; by an imperfect consecutive, Gen. 27, 33. 35, 3. 1 Sam. 2, 6. Jer. 13, 10 (after several participles); Ps. 18, 33. 136, 10 sq.

C. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE VERB.

§ 117. *The Direct Subordination of the Noun to the Verb as Accusative of the Object. The Double Accusative.*

1. The simplest way in which a noun is subordinated to a verbal *a* form is by the addition of an accusative of the object to a transitive verb². In the absence of case-endings³, this accusative can now be recognized only from the context, or by the particle אֶת (אֵת), before

¹ On the parallelism between the *external* and *internal* members, which appears here and in many other examples of this kind, see the note on § 114. *r*.

² The verb in question may either have been originally transitive, or only have become transitive by a modification of its original meaning. Thus the vocalization shows that הִשְׂפִּיעַ (*to have pleasure*, usually with אֶת) *to desire*, מָלַא (*to be full* of something, also transitive) *to fill*, were originally intransitive. Comp. also such cases as בָּכָה *to weep* (generally with אֶת, אֶל, or לְ), but also *to bewail* with an accusative; יָשַׁב *to dwell* (usually with אֶת), but also *to inhabit* with an accusative (comp. further, letter *u* below).—The examples are different in which verbs of motion such as בָּא *intrare*, also *aggredi*, יָצָא *egredi* (comp. § 116. *h* above), שָׁב *redire*, Is. 52, 8, take an accusative of the aim of the motion, while בָּא according to the Old Semitic usage, even takes an accusative of the person (at least in poetry, equivalent to אֶת בָּא in prose).

³ On traces of these endings, especially the remains of a former accusative ending in *a*, cf. § 90. *c* above.

suffixes also **תָּא**, **תָּוָא**)¹ prefixed to it. The use of this *nota accusativi* is, however, somewhat rare in poetry, and even in prose it is not invariably necessary but is restricted to those cases in which the accusative of the object is more closely determined by being a proper name, or by having the article, or by a following determinate genitive (hence also by the suffixes), or in some other way (see below, letter c), e.g. Gen. 4, 1 and she bare **אֶת־חַיִּן** Cain; 6, 10. 1, 1 God created **אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ** the heaven and the earth (but 2, 4 **וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם**); 1, 25 and God made **אֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה הָאָרֶץ** the beast of the earth; 2, 24.

- b Rem. 1. The rare occurrence of the *nota accusativi* in poetic style (e.g. it never occurs in Ex. 15, 2-18. Deut. 32. Jud. 5. 1 Sam. 2, &c.; on the other hand, it is frequent in the late Psalms) may be explained from the fact that in this as in other respects (comp. § 2. g) poetry represents a somewhat more archaic stage of the language than prose. The need of some external means of indicating the accusative could only have been felt after the case-endings had become wholly extinct. Even then the **תָּא** would probably have been used at first to indicate only an object placed *before* the verb (when it followed, it was already sufficiently characterized by its position as depending on the verb), or proper names². Finally, however, the *nota accusativi* became so customary everywhere in prose, that even the pronominal object was expressed rather by **תָּא** with suffixes than by verbal suffixes, even when none of the reasons mentioned under letter c can be assigned

¹ **תָּא** (toneless owing to the following Maqqeph), and **תָּוָא** (with a tone-long *ē*, **תָּוָא** only in Job 41, 26), **תָּא** or **תָּוָא** before the light suffixes according to § 103. b, Phœnician **תָּא** i.e. probably *tyyāth* (for the Phœnician form, cf. G. Hoffmann, *Einige phönik. Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1889, p. 39 sq.), Punic *yāth* or (according to Euting) pronounced even as a mere prefixed *t*, Arabic, before suffixes, 'iyyā, Aram. תָּא, תָּוָא, was no doubt originally a substantive, meaning *essence, substance, self* (like the Syriac *yāth*; on the other hand, any connexion with the Hebrew **תָּוָא**, Syriac *ālā*, Arabic *āyat*, a *sign*, must, with Nöldeke, *ZDMG*. xl. 738, be rejected), but now united in the construct state with a following noun or suffix stands for the pronoun *ipse, autrōs*. [In later Assyrian the pronominal suffixes are attached to the substantive *at-tu, essence*, and the two together form an emphatic repetition of a preceding suffix, e.g. *sir-ya at-tū-a, my own race*, prop. *my race* (which is *mine*, G.W.C.) In common use, however (cf. Wilson, 'The particle **תָּא** in Hebrew,' *Hebraica*, vi. 2, 3), it has so little force (like the oblique cases *autrōū, autrō, autrōn*, sometimes also *ipsius, ipsum*, and the Germ. *desselben*, &c.) that it merely serves to introduce a determinate object; **תָּא הַשָּׁמַיִם** prop. *autrōn tōn ouranōn* (comp. *αὐτῶν Χρονήδα*, *Iliad* i. 143) is no stronger than the simple **הַשָּׁמַיִם** *tōn ouranōn*.

² Thus, in Deut. 33, **תָּא** occurs only in verse 9 (twice with an object preceding the verb), in Gen. 49 in the blessing of Jacob only in verse 15 with a co-ordinate second object (consequently farther removed from the verb). Of the thirteen instances of **תָּא** in the Méša' inscription, seven stand directly and four indirectly before proper names.

for it; comp. Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 258 sqq., and the statistics of H. Petri, cited above at the head of § 58. Such examples as *כָּל־אִשָּׁר צָוָה אֹתוֹ* *Gen. 6, 22* in the *Priestly Code*, beside *וְהָיָה יְהוָה* *Gen. 7, 5* in the *Jahvist*, are especially instructive.

2. As accusatives determined in other ways, we have in the first place to consider the collectives introduced by *כָּל* *entirely*, without a following article or determinate genitive, inasmuch as the meaning of *כָּל* includes a determinative sense, comp. e. g. *Gen. 1, 21. 30. 8, 21. Dent. 2, 34. 2 Ki. 25, 9. אֶת־כָּל* is used absolutely in *Gen. 9, 3*, comp. *39, 23*; similarly, *מִי* is determinate of itself, since it always denotes a person, hence *אֶת־מִי* *quem?* e. g. *Is. 6, 8. 37, 23* and elsewhere, but never *אֶת־מִי* *quid?* so also the relative *אֲשֶׁר* in the sense of *cum qui* or *quem*, &c., e. g. *1 Sam. 16, 3*, or *id quod*, *Gen. 9, 24* and elsewhere. Comp. also such examples as *Jos. 2, 10. 1 Sam. 24, 19*, where *אֲשֶׁר* *אֵת* is equivalent to *the circumstance, that*, &c.—Elsewhere *אֵת* stands before nouns which are determinate in sense, although the article is omitted (which according to § 126. *h* is very frequently the case in poetic or otherwise elevated style); thus *Lev. 26, 5. Is. 41, 7. 50, 4. Ezek. 13, 20. 43, 10. Prov. 13, 21* (where the *צִדִּיקִים* are to be regarded as a distinct class); *Job 13, 25*; also *Eccles. 7, 7* may be a quotation of an ancient maxim.

On the other hand *אֵת* occurs very seldom in prose before a noun actually or apparently undetermined. In *1 Sam. 24, 6* *כִּנְיָה* is more closely defined by means of the following relative clause; in *2 Sam. 4, 11* *אִישׁ צָדִיק* refers to Ishbosheth (as if it were *him, who was an innocent man*); also in *13, 17* *וְאֵת* refers to a definite person, and in *1 Ki. 6, 16* *אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ* to the particular twenty cubits. In *Ex. 21, 28* (otherwise in verse 29) perhaps the *אֶת־* is used in order to avoid the combination *שׁוֹר אִישׁ* (as in *Num. 21, 9* to avoid the cacophony *הַנֶּחֱשֵׁת אִישׁ*); in *Lev. 7, 8* and *20, 10* the accusatives are at any rate defined by the context.—In *Num. 16, 15* *אֶת־אֶחָד מֵהֶם* probably means *even a single one* (and then *eo ipso* a definite one) of them, as also in *1 Sam. 9, 3* *אֶת־אֶחָד מֵהַנְּעָרִים* may refer to some definite one of the men-servants. In *Gen. 21, 30* we should read *אֶת־שִׁבְעֵי הַבָּכֹשֶׁת* as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, since the seven lambs have been already mentioned; and in *Ex. 2, 1* the original reading probably was *אִשָּׁה מִבְּנוֹת לִי*; in *Ex. 28, 9* read *הִשָּׁהם* with the Samaritan; in *Lev. 20, 14* *אֶת־אִשָּׁה* is probably a scribal error due to *אֶת־אִשָּׁה*; in *1 Sam. 26, 20* read *נִפְשִׁי* with the LXX for *אֶת־אֶחָד*; in *2 Sam. 5, 24* read *הַצִּדְוֹנָה* according to *1 Chron. 14, 15*; in *2 Sam. 15, 16* the *אֶת־* is incorrectly inserted from *20, 3*, where it refers to the women already mentioned; in *2 Sam. 18, 18* read *הַמִּצְבֶּת*, or omit both *אֶת־* and *אֲשֶׁר* with the LXX and Lucian; in *1 Ki. 12, 31* and *Est. 2, 3* omit *אֶת־*; in *2 Ki. 23, 20* probably *אֶת־עַצְמוֹתָם* is to be read; in *2 Ki. 25, 9* the text is obviously corrupt. In *Ezek. 16, 32* *אֶת־זָרִים* might refer to *the strangers in question*; see however, Smend on the passage.

3. The pronominal object *must* be represented by *אֵת* with a suffix (instead of a verbal suffix), when (*a*) it precedes the verb, e. g. *Num. 22, 33* *אֶתְּבָהּ הֲרַגְתִּי* *ואֶתְּבָהּ הַחַיִּיתִי* *I had slain thee and saved her alive*; *Gen. 7, 1. Lev. 22, 28. 1 Sam. 8, 7. Is. 43, 22. 57, 11. Jer. 4, 17. 22, 7, 19*; (*b*) when a suffix is already

attached to the verb, and as a rule when a second accusative with **וְ** follows, e.g. 2 Sam. 15, 25 **וְהִרְאֵנִי אוֹתוֹ** and he will show me it; Ex. 17, 3 **לְהַכִּית אֹתִי** to kill us and our children; Num. 16, 32. 2 Sam. 5, 11. 2 Sam. 14, 16 (but cf. also Deut. 11, 6. 15, 16, &c., and Driver on 1 Sam. 5, 10); (c) after an infinitive absolute, see above § 113. a note; (d) after an infinitive construct, when it is immediately followed by the subject, e.g. Gen. 41, 39, or when the combination of a suffix with the infinitive might lead to a misunderstanding, e.g. Gen. 4, 15 **לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹת אוֹתוֹ** lest one should smite him, &c., where **לְבַלְתִּי הַכּוֹתוֹ** might also mean lest he should smite.

f 4. The pronominal object is very frequently omitted, when it can be easily supplied from the context; so especially the neuter accusative referring to something previously mentioned (the English *it*) after *verba sentiendi* (**שָׁמַעַ**) and *dicendi*, e.g. Gen. 9, 22, &c., **וַיֹּדֶר** and he told (it); also after **נָתַן** to give, Gen. 18, 7. 24, 11 and elsewhere, **לָקַח** to take, **הָבִיא** to bring, **שָׁם** to lay, Gen. 9, 23 and elsewhere, **מָצָא** to find, Gen. 31, 33, and others. A personal object is omitted, e.g. in Gen. 12, 19. 24, 51 (after **לָקַח**).—The omission of the plural object is remarkable, because it leaves an opportunity for a misunderstanding, in Gen. 37, 17 **שָׁמַעְתִּי אֲמָרִים** ¹ I heard them saying; perhaps, however, we should read **שָׁמַעְתִּים** with the Samaritan Pentateuch.

g 5. In common formulae the substantival object is also sometimes omitted (an elliptical expression); thus e.g. **פָּרַת** 1 Sam. 20, 16 and elsewhere (see the Lexicon) stands for **פָּרַת בְּרִית** like the English *to close* (sc. a bargain) with any one; **נָקַר** to keep (sc. **אָף** anger) equivalent to *to be resentful*, Ps. 103, 9 and elsewhere; so also **שָׁמַר** Jer. 3, 5 (beside **נָקַר**); **נָשָׂא** for **נָשָׂא קוֹל** to lift up the voice, Is. 3, 7; **נָשָׂא לְ** for **נָשָׂא עוֹן לְ** to take away any one's sin (to forgive), Gen. 18, 24. 26. Is. 2, 9; **שָׁלַח** for **שָׁלַח יָד** to put forth (sc. **יָד** the hand) equivalent to *to reach after something*, 2 Sam. 6, 6. Ps. 18, 17.

h 6. *Verba sentiendi* may take a second object, generally in the form of a participle or adjective and necessarily indeterminate, to define more exactly the action or condition in which the object is perceived, e.g. Num. 11, 10 **וַיִּשְׁמַע מֹשֶׁה אֶת-הָעָם בְּכִה** and Moses heard the people weeping; Gen. 7, 1 **וַיֵּרָא אֶת-רְאִיתִי צְדִיקִים** *thee have I seen righteous*. Frequently, however, the second object is expressed by a separate clause. This is especially frequent with **רָאָה** to see, e.g. Gen. 1, 4 and God saw the light, that it was good; Gen. 6, 2. 12, 14. 13, 10. 49, 15. Ex. 2, 2. Ps. 25, 19. Prov. 23, 31. Job 22, 12. Eccles. 2, 24. 8, 17; so with **יָדַע** to know, Ex. 32, 22. 2 Sam. 3, 25. 17, 8 (with two objects); 1 Ki. 5, 17.

i 7. In certain instances **אֵת** serves apparently to introduce or to emphasize a nominative. This cannot be regarded as a reappearance of the original substantival meaning of the **אֵת**, since all unquestionable examples of the kind belong to the later Books of the Old Testament. They are rather (apart from textual errors or other explanations) cases of virtual dependence on an implied *verbum regens* understood. The constant use of **אֵת** to indicate a clause governed by the verb, necessarily led at length to the use of **אֵת** generally as a defining particle

¹ According to the ordinary rules of syntax (comp. § 116. f) we should translate, *I heard men who said, &c.*

irrespective of a governing verb. So in the Hebrew of the Mishna¹ (see above, § 3. a) אתו and אתה are prefixed to a nominative even without any special emphasis.

Naturally the above does not apply to any of the places in which את is not the *nota accusativi*, but a preposition (on את with, comp. § 103. a), e. g. Is. 57, 15. 1 Sam. 17, 34 (את־הדב and that, with a bear; את־ here, however, has probably been interpolated from verse 36, where it is wanted); nor the places in which the accusative is subordinate to a passive (according to § 121. c) or to a verb of wanting as in Jos. 22, 17 and Neh. 9, 32, see below, letter s. In Ezek. 43, 17 את־הוא governs like a verb, being followed by את־הוא.

Other cases are clearly due to attraction to a following relative pronoun in the accusative (Ezek. 14, 22. Hag. 2, 5. Zech. 8, 17) or the accusative depends on a verbal idea, virtually contained in what has gone before, and consequently present to the speaker's mind as governing the accusative. Thus Num. 3, 26 (the verbal idea contained in וַתִּשְׁמְרוּ verse 25 is they had to take charge of); in Jos. 17, 11 לִי implies it was given up or they gave him; 1 Sam. 26, 16 see, where is equivalent to search now for; in 2 Sam. 11, 25 אֶל־יָרֵעַ בְּעֵינַיִךְ is used in the sense of noli aegre ferre²; Jer. 36, 33 and he had the brasier before him; in Eccles. 4, 3 a verb like I esteem is mentally supplied before אֶת אֲשֶׁר. On Jos. 22, 17. Neh. 9, 32, see below, letter aa.—Aposiopesis occurs in Deut. 11, 2 for not your children (do I mean); still more boldly in Zech. 7, 7, where either שְׁמַעְתֶּם or תִּשְׁמְעוּ (תִּשְׁמְעוּ) is to be supplied.

Setting aside a few undoubtedly corrupt passages³ there still remain the following examples, in which את in the later Hebrew manner (almost in the sense of the Latin quod attinet ad) introduces a noun with more or less emphasis, Num. 3, 46. 5, 10. 35, 6. Jud. 20, 44. 46. Ezek. 17, 21. 20, 16. 35, 10. 44, 3. Neh. 9, 19. 34. Dan. 9, 13. 2 Chron. 31, 17.—In Ezek. 47, 17–19 (comp. also 43, 7) it is easy to emend את־הוא for את־, according to verse 20. However, even the LXX, who have ταῦτα only in verse 18, can hardly have known any other reading than את; consequently in all these passages את must be regarded as virtually dependent on some governing word, such as ecce (LXX 43, 7 ἐξάπαξ), and 47, 17 sqq. as equivalent to thou shalt have as a border, &c.

8. Among the solecisms of a later period is finally the introduction of the object by the preposition ל (prop. in relation to, in the direction of), as sometimes

¹ Comp. Weiss, משפּט לשון המשנה (Vienna, 1867), p. 112.

² So also in 1 Sam. 20, 13 the Qal (יִטֵּב) is, with Wellhausen, to be read instead of the Hiph'il.

³ Thus 1 Sam. 26, 10, where וְאֵי is to be read for וְאֵת; 1 Ki. 11, 25, where at present the predicate of the relative clause is wanting; in 2 Ki. 6, 5 the את is probably derived from a text which read the Hiph'il instead of נִפְל. In Jer. 23, 33 instead of the artificial explanation what a burden (is, do ye ask?) we should read with the LXX and Vulg. אֲנִי הֵמָּנָה ye are the burden. In Ezek. 10, 22 מְרִאֲהֶם וְאֲהֶם is unintelligible; in 37, 19 read with Hitzig אֶל־ for את; in Hag. 2, 17 read with the LXX שְׂבַכְכֶם for אַתְּכֶם.

in Ethiopic¹ and very commonly in Aramaic². Less remarkable is this looser connexion of the object with a participle, as with אָכַל Lam. 4, 5, אָמַף Num. 10, 25, וָרָף Ps. 145, 14 (but cf. 146, 8), צָרַר Num. 25, 18, הִשְׁמִיחַ and שָׁמַח Job 12, 23; before the participle Is. 11, 9.—To introduce an object *preceding* the finite verb ל is employed in Job 5, 2 (comp. also Dan. 11, 38); also after אָהַב Lev. 19, 18, 34; הָאֲרִיזָה Ps. 129, 3; הִבְדִּיל Ezra 8, 24. 2 Chron. 25, 10; הָבִין Job 9, 11; בָּרַךְ 1 Chron. 29, 20 (immediately before with an accusative); הִנֵּלָה 1 Chron. 5, 26; דָּרַשׁ Ezra 6, 21. 1 Chron. 22, 19. 2 Chron. 17, 13; הִלֵּל 1 Chron. 16, 36. 2 Chron. 5, 13; הִרְגַּ 2 Sam. 3, 30. Ps. 135, 11 (verse 10 with accusative), 136, 19; חָבַשׁ (to bind up) Is. 61, 1 (Ezek. 34, 4 before the verb); יָדַע Ps. 69, 6; לָקַח Jer. 40, 2; הִסְמִיךְ and הִסְמִיךָ 1 Chron. 29, 22; בָּהַל 2 Chron. 28, 15; סָמַךְ Ps. 145, 14; עֲזַב 1 Chron. 16, 37; הֶעֱלָה Ezek. 26, 3; פָּתַח Ps. 116, 16; יָרַךְ Job 19, 28; הִצִּיֵּק Is. 53, 11; שָׁכַר 2 Chron. 24, 12 (previously accusatives); שִׁים 1 Sam. 22, 7 (but probably וְלִבְכֶם is to be read); הֵשִׁיב (in the connexion לְ הֵשִׁיב דָּבָר) 2 Chron. 10, 6 (but verse 9 and 1 Ki. 12, 9 with an accusative); שָׁחַת Num. 32, 15. 1 Sam. 23, 10; שִׁית Ps. 73, 18; שָׁלַח Ezra 8, 16. 2 Chron. 17, 7; שָׁמַר 2 Chron. 5, 11.

o 9. Sometimes the verb, on which an accusative of the object really depends, is contained only in sense in the verb which apparently governs, e.g. Is. 14, 17 אֲסִירָיו לֹא־פָתַח בֵּיתָהּ *his prisoners he let not loose nor sent them back to their home*. Comp. Ps. 74, 15 and on this *constructio praeagnans* in general, see § 119. ff.

p 2. With the proper accusatives of the object may also be classed what is called the *internal* or *absolute object* (also named *schema etymologicum* or *figura etymologica*), i.e. the addition of an object in the form of a noun derived from the same stem³, e.g. Ps. 14, 5 פָּחַד פָּחַד *they feared a fear* (i.e. they were in great fear) Prov. 15, 27; also with the object preceding, e.g. Lam. 1, 8 הָמָא הָמָא יִרְשָׁלַם *Jerusalem hath sinned a sin*; with a double accusative (see below, letter cc), e.g. 1 Ki. 1, 12 אֶעֱצֶה נָא עֲצָה *let me, I pray thee, give thee counsel*; 1 Sam. 1, 6⁴.

q Rem. (a) Strictly speaking the only cases of this kind are those in which the verbal idea is supplemented by means of an *indeterminate* substantive (see the examples above). Such a substantive, except in the case of the addition of the internal object to denominative verbs (see below), is, like the infinitive

¹ Dillmann, *Grammatik der Äthiopischen Sprache*, p. 349.

² With regard to Biblical Aramaic, see Kautzsch's *Grammatik des Bibl. Aram.*, p. 151 sq. In other ways, also, a tendency may be observed in later Hebrew to make use of the looser connexion by means of prepositions instead of the closer subordination of the noun in the accusative.

³ On a kindred use of the infinitive absolute as an *internal object*, see above, § 113. w.

⁴ Comp. *βουλὰς βουλεύειν*, Il. x. 147.

absolute, never altogether without force, but rather serves like it to strengthen the verbal idea. This strengthening is implied in the indeterminateness of the internal object, analogous to such exclamations as, *this was a man*! Hence it is intelligible that some intensifying attribute is very frequently (as in Greek usually) added to the internal object, e.g. Gen. 27, 34 וַיִּצְעַק צָעָקָה נְדִילָה וַיִּמְרָה עַרְמָאֵד *he cried (with) an exceeding great and bitter cry*; comp. the Greek *voseiv vōsov kachn, ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην* (Mat. 2, 10); *magnum pugnare pugnam, tutiorem vitam vivere, &c.*

Examples of an internal object *after* the verb, and without further addition, are Ex. 22, 5. 2 Sam. 12, 16. Is. 42, 17. Ezek. 26, 15. Zech. 1, 2. Prov. 21, 26; with an intensifying attribute, Gen. 27, 33. Ex. 32, 31. Jud. 15, 8. 2 Sam. 13, 36. 1 Ki. 1, 40 (comp. Jon. 4, 6. 1 Chron. 29, 9); Is. 21, 7. 45, 17. Jon. 1, 10. Zech. 1, 14. 8, 2 a. Dan. 11, 3; along with an object proper the internal object occurs with an attribute in Gen. 12, 17. 2 Sam. 13, 15; comp. also Is. 14, 6. Jon. 4, 1.—An internal object with an attribute is found *before* the verb, in Jer. 14, 17. Zech. 1, 15 (comp. also Gen. 30, 8. Jer. 22, 19. 30, 14. Ps. 139, 22). Instead of the substantive which would naturally be expected, another of kindred meaning is used in Zech. 8, 2.

(b) Only in a wider sense can the *schema etymologicum* be made to include cases in which the denominative verb is connected with the noun from which it is derived, e.g. Gen. 1, 11. 9, 14. 11, 3. 37, 7. Ezek. 18, 2. Ps. 144, 6, probably also Mic. 2, 4, or where this substantive, made determinate in some way, follows its verb, e.g. Gen. 30, 37. Num. 25, 11. 2 Ki. 4, 13. 13, 14. Is. 45, 17. Lam. 3, 58², and, determinate at least in sense, Jer. 22, 16; or precedes it as in 2 Ki. 2, 16. Is. 8, 12. 62, 5. Zech. 3, 7; comp. also Ex. 3, 9. In both cases the substantive is used, without any special emphasis, merely for clearness or as a more convenient way of connecting the verb with other members of the sentence.

3. Verbs which denote *speaking* (*crying out, weeping*), or any external act, frequently take a direct accusative of the organ or means by which the action is performed. In this case, however, the accusative must be more closely determined by an attributive adjective or a noun in the genitive. This fact shows the close relation between these accusatives and the *internal objects* treated above, letter *p*, which also, according to letter *q*, mostly take an intensifying attribute. On the other hand, they must not be regarded as adverbial (instrumental) accusatives, nor are they to be classed with the second (neuter) subjects treated below in § 144. *l*.

Examples of the accusative following the verb are וַאֲזַעַק קוֹל-נְדוּל and *I cried a loud voice* i.e. with a loud voice, Ezek. 11, 13. 2 Sam. 15, 23 (after the proper

¹ The Arab grammarians assign to the indeterminate cases generally an intensive sense in many instances; hence the commentators on the *Qordn* usually explain such cases by prefixing *and what kind of . . .*! see § 125. *b*.

² Also in Ps. 13, 4 *lest I sleep the sleep of death*, הַמָּוֶת is only used pregnantly for שְׁנַת הַמָּוֶת (comp. Jer. 51, 39), as צַדִּיקוֹת Is. 33, 15 for צַדִּיקוֹת הַדָּרָה.

object, Dent. 5, 19. 1 Ki. 8, 55); Ps. 109, 2 *they have spoken unto me* שָׁמַעְתִּי שֶׁפֶה אֶתְּמַר *a tongue of deceit*, i. e. with a lying tongue; Prov. 10, 4 *he becometh poor* עָלָה עֵלָה בְּיָדָיו *dealing a slack hand*, i. e. who dealeth with a slack hand; comp. the German *eine schöne Stimme singen*, to sing a fine voice, *eine tüchtige Klinge schlagen*, to smite a trusty sword, *Schlittschuhe laufen*, to run skates (i. e. to skate), and our *to write a good hand*, *to play ball*, &c.—Examples of the accusative preceding are יְהִלֵּלִי פִי רִנָּתָהּ שִׁמְחֵי שְׂפִיתַי *my mouth shall praise (thee) with joyful lips*, Ps. 63, 6; comp. Ps. 12, 3, where a *casus instrumenti* with אֲנִי follows the accusative.

- 11 4. Many verbs originally intransitive (sometimes even in form; see above, letter *a*, note 2) may be used also as transitives, in consequence of a certain modification of their original meaning, which has gradually become established by usage; comp. e. g. רָבַח *to strive*, but also with an accusative *causam alicuius agere* (so even in Is. 1, 17, &c.; elsewhere with לְ of the person for whom one strives); יָכַל absolutely *to be able*, with an accusative *to prevail over* any one; הִפְתִּין *to be inclined* and רָצָה *to have pleasure* (usually with אֲנִי), with an accusative *to wish for some one or something*; שָׁכַב *cubare*, then in the sense of *concupere*, originally always joined with עִם *cum*, but in later Hebrew also with the accusative, Gen. 34, 2, equivalent to *comprimere (feminam)*, &c.

- v Rem. 1. It is certainly difficult to decide whether some verbs, which were afterwards used absolutely or joined with prepositions, were not nevertheless originally *transitive*, and consequently it is only the supposed original meaning, usually assigned to them in English, which causes them to appear *intransitive*¹. In that case there is of course no syntactical peculiarity to be considered, and a list of such verbs would at the most be requisite only for practical purposes. Moreover, it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive, e. g. perhaps לָבַשׁ *to be clothed* along with לָבַשׁ *to put on* (a garment). Finally the analogy of certain transitives in constant use may have led to intransitives of kindred meaning being also united directly with the accusative, so that, in other words, whole classes of verbs came to be regarded in a particular aspect as transitives. See below, letter *y*.

- w 2. The modification of the original meaning becomes especially evident when even reflexive conjugations (*Niph'al*, *Hithpa'el*, &c.) take an accusative (cf. § 57, note 3); e. g. נָבֵא *to prophesy*, Jer. 25, 13; נָסַב (prop. *to put oneself round*) *to surround*, Jud. 19, 22; נָלַחַם *to fight*, Ps. 109, 3 (where, however, the *Qal* הִלַּחֲמֵנִי should be read; comp. Ps. 35, 1); also הִתְנַחֵל *to shave (something) for oneself*, Num. 6, 19; הִתְנַחֵל

¹ Thus e. g. עָנָה *to reply* (ἀποκρίσθαι τινα), *to answer any one*; צִוָּה *to command* (iubere aliquem); זָכַר *to remember*; קָנָה (לְ) *to wait for any one* (to expect any one); בָּשָׂר *to bring glad tidings to any one* (see the Lexicon); נָאָף and נָאָף *to commit adultery* (adulterare matronam); עָבַד *to serve* (colere); עָרַב *to become surety for . . .*, and many others.

to take some one for oneself as a possession, Is. 14, 2; הִתְנַחֵל to make some one an object of craft, Gen. 37, 18; הִתְנַחֵל to strip a thing off oneself, Ex. 33, 6; הִתְעַפֵּר to bring on oneself the anger of any one, to anger him; הִתְבַּחֵן to consider something, Job 37, 14. Cf. § 54. f.

3. So also it is only owing to a modification of the original meaning of a verb *x* (except where the expression is incorrect, and perhaps derived from the popular language), when sometimes the remoter object (otherwise introduced by ל) is directly subordinated in the form of an accusative suffix, e.g. Zech. 7, 5 הָצוּם הָיָה לְיָדֵי אֲנִי הָיָה לְיָדֵי אֲנִי *did ye fast at all unto me, even to me?* as though to say, have ye *de-fasted* me? have ye reached me with your fasting? Still more strange is Job 31, 18 נִרְלַי כְּאָבִי הֵהוּא (the orphan) *grew up to me as to a father*; comp. Is. 27, 4. 65, 5. Jer. 31, 3, and in Aramaic Dan. 5, 6; but אֲרָץ הַנֶּחֱבֵה נָתַתִּי Jos. 15, 19 is to be regarded as a double accusative after a verb of *giving*. In Is. 44, 21, instead of the Niph'al, read תַּלְשֵׁנִי; in Ezek. 29, 3 either עָשִׂיתִי is to be read with Olshausen or עָשִׂיתִים (and previously אֲרִי) with Smend; in Ps. 42, 5 אֲדָדָה or אֲדָדִים.

4. Whole classes of verbs, which, according to letter *v* above, are regarded as *y* *transitive*, either on account of their original meaning or (for the sake of analogy) by a modification of that meaning, are—

(a) Verba *induendi* and *exuendi*, as לָבַשׁ to put on, הִשָּׁט to put off a garment, עָדָה to put on ornaments, to adorn oneself with (cf. also מִשְׁפָּצִים עָדָה enclosed in gold, Ex. 28, 20). Also in poetic expressions such as Ps. 65, 14 לָבַשׁ בָּרִים הָעֲשֵׂן the pastures are clothed with flocks, comp. Ps. 109, 29; 104, 2 (עֲשָׂה); 65, 14 b (עֲשָׂה), &c.¹

(b) Verba *copiae* and *inopiae* (also called verba *abundandi* and *deficiendi*), as מָלָא *z* to be full of something, Ex. 8, 17; here, and also frequently elsewhere, construed with אֶת, and hence evidently with an accusative; Gen. 6, 13; with a personal object, Ex. 15, 9 *my lust shall be satisfied upon them*; with an accusative preceding the verb for the sake of emphasis, e.g. Is. 1, 15 *your hands are full of blood*, comp. Is. 22, 2; so also the Niph. נִמְלָא to fill oneself with something, e.g. Gen. 6, 11. Ex. 1, 7 (where the object is connected by אֶת); Is. 2, 7 sq. 6, 4. Prov. 3, 10; נִנְרַע to be fructified with, Num. 5, 28; שָׂרַץ to swarm with, Gen. 1, 20. 21. Ex. 7, 28; שָׂבַע (שָׂבַע) to be full of, Is. 1, 11. Joel 2, 19. Prov. 12, 11; נִבְרַח to become strong, to wax mighty in something, Job 21, 7; פָּרַץ to overflow with something, Prov. 3, 10 (with the object preceding); יָרַד prop. to descend, poetically also to pour down, to overflow with something (comp. in Greek *ὑπερέειν* *ὑδωρ*, *δάμνα σράειν*), e.g. Lam. 3, 48 פָּלְגֵי מַיִם הָרַד עֵינַי mine eye runneth down with rivers of water; 1, 16. Jer. 9, 17. 13, 17. Ps. 119, 136; so also הִלָּךְ to run over with, to flow with, Joel 4, 18; נָזַל to gush out with, Jer. 9, 17; נָפַף to drop, to overflow with, Jud. 5, 4. Joel 4, 18 a; פָּרַח to break forth, Ex. 9, 9; שָׁמַף to overflow, to pour forth, but also (transitively) to overflow with, Is. 10, 22; נִבְרַח to bud with, Prov. 10, 31; so perhaps also עָבַר to pass over, to overflow with,

¹ From the idea of *covering oneself with* something, we might also, if necessary, explain Ex. 30, 20 יִרְחֲצוּ מֵיִם they shall wash themselves with water; but the reading is simply to be emended to the ordinary בַּמֵּיִם.

Jer. 5, 28; *לָךְ* to go forth with, Amos 5, 3.—Especially bold, but still on the analogy of the above examples, is Is. 5, 6, where it is said of a vineyard *לֹא יִשְׁמַר וְלֹא יִשְׁקֹר* but it shall come up (it shall be overgrown) with briars and thorns; comp. Prov. 24, 31, and still more boldly, Is. 34, 13.

aa With the opposite idea, *חָסַר* to be in want of, to lack, Gen. 18, 28; *שָׁבַל* to be bereaved of (as though it were to lose), Gen. 27, 45.—In Jos. 22, 17 even *הִמְעַטְנוּ* (prop. *was there too little for us of . . . ?*) as being equivalent to a verbum inopiae (= had we too little of . . . ?) is construed with an accusative; cf. Neh. 9, 32.

bb (c) Several verbs of dwelling; the accusative in this case expresses either the place or the thing at which or with which any one tarries; thus Gen. 4, 20 after *יָשַׁב*, cf. § 118. g; Jud. 5, 17. Is. 33, 14 after *יָגַר*; Is. 33, 16 with *שָׁכַן*; or even the person (the people) with whom any one dwells or is a guest, as Ps. 5, 5. 120, 5 after *יָגַר*.

cc 5. Two accusatives (usually one of the person and one of the thing) are governed by—

(a) The causative conjugations (*Pi'el*, *Hiph'il*, sometimes also *Pilpel*, e. g. *כִּלְכַּל* Gen. 47, 12 and elsewhere) of verbs which are simply transitive in *Qal*, and hence also of *verba induendi* and *exuendi*, &c. (comp. above, letters *a* and *u*, and also *y*, *z*), e. g. Ex. 33, 18 *אֶת־כְּבוֹדִי נִא אֶרְאֶיךָ* show me, I pray thee, thy glory. Thus very frequently *הוֹדִיעַ* to cause some one to know something; *לִמַּד* docere aliquem aliquid, &c.; comp. further, Gen. 41, 42 *וַיַּעַשׂ אֹתוֹ בְּגָדֵי שֵׁשׁ* and he caused him to put on vestures of fine linen (he arrayed him in vestures, &c.); comp. in the opposite sense, Gen. 37, 23 (both accusatives after *הִקְשִׁיט* introduced by *אֶת*); so with *מָלֵא* to fill, to fill up with something, Gen. 21, 19. 26, 15. Ex. 28, 3; *אַזָּר* to gird some one with something, Ps. 18, 33; *עִטַּר* to crown, Ps. 8, 6 and elsewhere; *חָסַר* to cause some one to lack something, Ps. 8, 6; *הֵאָכִיל* to feed some one with something, Ex. 16, 32; *הִשְׁקָה* to make some one drink something, Gen. 19, 32 sqq.

dd (b) Many verbs (even in *Qal*) which express an influence upon the object through some external means. The latter, in this case, is attached as a second object. They are especially—

ee (a) Verbs which express covering, clothing, overlaying, *חָנַר* Ex. 29, 9, *צָפָה* Ex. 26, 29 and elsewhere, *כָּסָה* Ezek. 13, 10 sqq., *עִטַּר* Ps. 5, 13; comp. also *אָבֵן* Jos. 7, 25 and elsewhere; hence also verbs which express sowing (*וָרַע* Jud. 9, 45. Is. 17, 10. 30, 23), planting (Is. 5, 2), anointing (Ps. 45, 8) with anything.

ff (b) Expressions of giving, thus *נָתַן* Jos. 15, 19 where the accusative of the thing precedes; endowing, *נָדַר* Gen. 30, 20; and its opposite taking away, as *קָבַע* Prov. 22, 23; *בֵּרַךְ* to bless some one with something, Gen. 49, 25. Deut. 15, 14;

to give graciously, הָנִן Gen. 33, 5; to sustain (i.e. to support, to maintain, to furnish) with anything, e.g. Gen. 27, 37. Ps. 51, 14 (שָׁמַר); Jud. 19, 5 (שָׁמַר); to do something to one, מָלַךְ Gen. 50, 15. 17. 1 Sam. 24, 18; comp. also קָדַם to come to meet any one with something, Ps. 21, 4, שָׁלַם to repay some one with something (with two accusatives, Ps. 35, 12. Prov. 13, 21), and for the accusative of the person comp. εἰς, καὶς πᾶρτεν τινά. In a wider sense we may also include such phrases as *they hunt every man his brother with a net*, Mic. 7, 2; to shoot at one with arrows, Ps. 64, 8 (though this is against the accents), &c.

(γ) Expressions of asking some one for something, desiring something from some one (שָׁאַל Deut. 14, 26. Ps. 137, 3); answering any one anything (עָנָה Mic. 6, 5 and elsewhere; comp. in the other conjugations דָּבַר הָשִׁיב prop. *verbum reddere* with an accusative of the person, 1 Ki. 12, 6 and elsewhere, also in the sense of announcing; sometimes also הִגִּיד to declare something to some one, Job 26, 4 and elsewhere, for הִגִּיד); צָוָה to enjoin a person something, Ex. 34, 32. Deut. 1, 18. 32, 46. Jer. 7, 23.

(δ) Expressions which mean to make, to build, to form something out of something; *h/h* in such cases, besides the accusative of the object proper, another accusative is used for the material of which the thing is made, e.g. Gen. 2, 7 יָצַר יְהוָה אֱדָמָה וַיַּעַשׂ אֱתָהּ אָדָם וַיִּבְרָא אֱתָהּ מִפֶּיט הָאָרֶץ and *Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground*; so with יָצַר also in 1 Ki. 7, 15; further Ex. 38, 3 נָחֲשֶׁת נָעָשָׂה כָּל־כֵּלָיו *all the vessels thereof made he of brass* (for another explanation of the accusative נָחֲשֶׁת, linguistically possible but excluded by the context, see below, letter *ii* with *h/h*); comp. Ex. 25, 18. 28, 26, 1. 14 sq. 29, 27, 1. 36, 8. 1 Ki. 7, 27; with a preceding accusative of the material, Ex. 25, 29. 29, 2. Deut. 27, 6 אֲבָנִים שְׁלֵמוֹת תִּבְנֶה יְהוָה אֱתָהּ מִבְּנֵי יְהוָה of *unhewn stones shalt thou build the altar of the Lord*.

(c) Verbs which express making, preparing, forming into anything, *ii* along with the object proper, take a second accusative of the product, e.g. Gen. 27, 9 אֶעֱשֶׂה אֹתָם מִטְעָמִים *I will make them (the kids) into savoury meat*; comp. Gen. 6, 14. 16. Ex. 26, 1 δ. 30, 25. 32, 4. Is. 44, 15. Hos. 8, 4. 1 Ki. 18, 32 וַיִּבְנֶה אֱתָהּ אֲבָנִים מִבְּנֵי and *he built the stones (into) an altar*; so also אָפָה, with two accusatives, to bake something into something, Ex. 12, 39. Lev. 25, 4; שָׂם (prop. *to set up for* something, comp. Gen. 27, 37. 28, 18. Ps. 39, 9, and הִרִים Gen. 31, 45) to change into something, Jos. 8, 28. Is. 50, 2. 51, 10. Mic. 1, 7. 4, 13¹; with two accusatives of the person (to appoint, promote any one to the position of a . . .), Is. 3, 7; נָתַן is also used in the same sense with two accusatives, Gen. 17, 5, and שָׂם 1 Ki. 11, 34; as a rule, however, the description of the position, and also frequently of the product, is introduced by לְ to, § 119. *i*; also

[¹ This occurs also in Syriac, see Knös, *Chrest.*, p. 87, 15; and still more extensively in such languages as the Dyak. The Semitic languages dislike adjectival formations to indicate the material.—G.W.C.]

שׁוּת *to make a thing so and so* (Is. 5, 6. 26, 1; with a personal object, Ps. 21, 7¹. 91, 9); הָחֹשֶׁךְ *to make dark*, Am. 5, 8. Of the same class also are instances like Job 28, 2 אֶבֶן נְחֹשֶׁה אֶבֶן נְחֹשֶׁה *a stone they smelt into brass*; 1 Ki. 11, 30 עָשָׂר קְרָעִים וַיִּסְרְטָהּ שָׁנִים *and rent it (the garment) into twelve pieces*; cf. Is. 37, 26, accusative of the product before the object proper, after לְהַשְׁמִית *to lay waste*. On a second object with *verba sentiendi* (as יָדַע *to know something to be something*, Eccles. 7, 25; רָאָה *to see, find to be*, Gen. 7, 1; חָשַׁב *to esteem one to be something*, Is. 53, 4, elsewhere always construed with לְ or בְּ), cf. letter *h*.

kk Rem. At first sight some of the examples given above appear to be identical in character with those treated under letter *hh*; thus it is possible, e.g. in 1 Ki. 18, 32, by a translation which equally suits the sense, *he built from the stones an altar*, to explain מִן־הָאֲבָנִים as the nearer object and אֶת־הָאֲבָנִים as an accusative of the material, and the construction would then be exactly the same as in Deut. 27, 6. In reality, however, the fundamental idea is by no means the same. Not that in the living language an accusative of the material in the one case, and in the other an accusative of the product were consciously distinguished. As Driver (*Tenses*, § 195) rightly observes, the remoter accusative in both cases is, strictly speaking, in apposition to the nearer. This is especially evident in such examples as Ex. 20, 25 *thou shalt not build them* (the stones of the altar) בָּנִיתָ as *hewn stones*, comp. also Gen. 1, 27. The main point is, which of the two accusatives, as being primarily affected (or aimed at) by the action, is to be made the more prominent; and on this point neither the position of the words (the nearer object, mostly determinate, as a rule follows immediately after the verb), nor even the context admits of much doubt. Thus in 1 Ki. 18, 32 the treatment of the stones is the primary object in view, the erection of the altar for which they were intended is the secondary; in Deut. 27, 6 the case is reversed.

11 (*d*) Finally, the second accusative sometimes more closely determines the nearer object by indicating the part or member specially affected by the action¹, e.g. Ps. 3, 8 *for thou hast smitten all mine enemies* לְחִי (as to) *the cheek bone*, equivalent to *upon the cheek bone*; comp. Gen. 37, 21 *let us not smite him* נִפְשׁוֹ *in the life*, i.e. let us not kill him; Deut. 22, 26. 2 Sam. 3, 27; also with שָׁף Gen. 3, 15; with רָעָה Jer. 2, 16; in poetry the object specially concerned is, by a bold construction, even placed first, Deut. 33, 11 (with מִצֵּי).

¹ Comp. the very pregnant expression of the same character in Ps. 21, 13 בָּנֵם תְּשַׁחֲמוּ *for thou shalt make them (as) a neck*, i.e. *thou shalt cause them to turn their necks (backs) to me*; similarly Ps. 18, 41 (2 Sam. 22, 41. Ex. 23, 27); רָחַף אֵיבִי נִתְּתָה לִי עֲרָף *thou hast given mine enemies unto me as a back*; comp. Jer. 18, 17.

² Analogous to this is the σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ κατὰ μέρος in Greek epic poetry, e.g. ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγε ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

§ 118. *The Looser Subordination of the Accusative to the Verb.*

1. The various forms of the looser subordination of a noun to the *a* verb are distinguished from the different kinds of the accusative of the object (§ 117) by their specifying not the persons or things directly affected by the action, but some *more immediate circumstance* under which an action or an event takes place. Of such circumstances the most common are those of *place, time, measure, cause*, and finally the *manner* of performing the action. These nearer definitions are, as a rule, placed *after* the verb; they may, however, also precede it.

Rem. That the cases thus loosely subordinated to the verb are to be regarded *b* as *accusatives*, is seen first from the fact that in certain instances the *nota accusativi* (תִּנְיָן) may be prefixed; secondly from the fact that in one form of the *casus loci* a termination (תִּנְיָן־) is employed, in which (according to § 90. c) the old accusative ending is preserved; and finally from the consistency with which classical Arabic puts these nearer definitions in the accusative (which may be recognized by its form) even under circumstances in which one would be rather inclined to expect a nominative in apposition.

The relation subsisting between the circumstantial accusative and the accusative *c* of the object is especially apparent when the former (as e. g. in a statement of the goal after a verb of motion) is immediately connected with its verb. But even the more loosely connected circumstantial definitions are certainly to be regarded as originally objects of a governing word habitually omitted, only that the consciousness of this closer government was at length lost, and the accusative more and more acquired an independent value as a *casus adverbialis*.

2. The accusative serves to define more precisely the *place d* (*accus. loci*), either (*a*) in answer to the question *whither?* after verbs of motion¹, or (*b*) in answer to the question *where?* after verbs of *being, dwelling, resting*, &c. (but also after transitive verbs, see the examples), or finally (*c*) to define more precisely the *extent* in space, in answer to the question *how far? how high? how much?* &c.

Instead of the simple accusative, the locative (see above, § 90. c)² is frequently *e* found in the cases mentioned under letter *f* (sometimes also in those under letter *g*) or the preposition תַּלְמַד³, especially before persons as the aim of the movement, or בְּ, usually to express being *at* a place.

Examples of (*a*): הֵצִיאוּנוּ מִן־הַשָּׂדֶה let us go out into the field, 1 Sam. 20, 11; comp. *f* Gen. 27, 3. 31, 4. Job 29, 7; הָלַכְתָּ לְתַרְשִׁישׁ to go to Tarshish, 2 Chron. 20, 36;

¹ So commonly in Sanskrit; in Greek only poetically, e. g. Il. I. 317 κλισίῃ δ' ὀδὸν ἔειπεν: in Latin, e. g. *rus ire, Romam proficisci*.

² Hence e. g. in 1 Sam. 9, 26 the Masora requires הֵצִיאוּנוּ instead of the K^ath. הֵצִיאוּ.

³ So in Jud. 19, 18 for אֶת־בֵּית הָאֵל the better reading is בֵּית־אֵל.

comp. Gen. 10, 11, 13, 9, 24, 27, 26, 33, 31, 21. Ex. 4, 9, 17, 10. Jud. 1, 26. 2 Ki. 11, 19. Nah. 1, 8 (1). Ps. 134, 2; with *נֶחֱן* Jos. 6, 24; with the *accus. loci* emphatically preceding (cf. Driver on 1 Sam. 5, 8), 1 Ki. 2, 26. Is. 23, 12. Jer. 2, 10, 20, 6, 32, 5; with *בוא* (in the sense of *aggre*di equivalent to *על*—*בוא על*, comp. § 117. a, note 2) the *personal* aim also is poetically added in the accusative, Ezek. 32, 11, 38, 11. Prov. 10, 24, 28, 22. Job 15, 21, 20, 22; but in the last passage it is better taken as an accusative of the object (comp. the German *einen ankommen, überkommen*). See also Num. 10, 36 (where *שוב* can hardly be transitive); Jud. 11, 29. 1 Sam. 13, 20.—Finally, comp. also the use of *אֵשׁ* for *אֵשׁ . . . אֵשׁ* *whither*, Num. 13, 27.—The *accus. loci* occurs after a passive, e. g. Gen. 12, 15.

- g Examples of (δ): Gen. 38, 11 *remain a widow* בֵּית אָבִיךָ *in thy father's house*; comp. Gen. 24, 23. 1 Sam. 17, 15. 2 Sam. 2, 32. Is. 3, 6. Hos. 12, 5. Mic. 6, 10. 2 Chron. 33, 20; בֵּית הָאֹהֶל *in the tent door*, Gen. 18, 1. 10, 19, 11 and frequently. As observed by Driver on 1 Sam. 2, 29, accusatives of this kind are almost without exception (but cf. Is. 16, 2. 2 Chron. 33, 20) connected with a noun in the genitive. In all the above examples, however, the accusative may have been preferred to the natural construction with *ב* for euphonic reasons, in order to avoid the combination of such sounds as *בֵּב* and *בֵּפ*; comp., moreover, Gen. 2, 14, 4, 16. Ex. 18, 5. Lev. 6, 8 *רִמְסֵם בֵּית* instead of the usual *רִמְסֵם בֵּית* Ex. 29, 13 &c.); Deut. 1, 2, 19¹. 2 Sam. 17, 26. 1 Ki. 7, 8. Prov. 8, 3, 9, 14. On Is. 1, 30 see § 116. i; on *לֵשׁ*, with the *accus. loci*, see § 117. δδ. On the other hand, in Deut. 6, 3, according to the LXX, a verb of *giving* has dropped out before *אֶרֶץ*.

- h Examples of (c): Gen. 7, 20 *fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail*; Gen. 31, 23, 41, 40 *מִסְפַּר אֲנִלִּי מִסְפַּר אֲנִלִּי* *only in the throne will I be greater than thou*; Deut. 1, 19 *we went (through) all that great and terrible wilderness*; comp. Job 29, 3. Of the same kind also are such cases as Ex. 16, 16 (*according to the number of your persons*, for which elsewhere *לְמִסְפַּר* is used); 1 Sam. 6, 4 (with the *accus. preceding*); 6, 18. 2 Sam. 21, 20. Job 1, 5.—A statement of weight is put in the accusative in 2 Sam. 14, 26.

- i 3. The accusative is employed to determine more precisely the *time* (*accus. temporis*), (a) in answer to the question *when?* e. g. הַיּוֹם *the day*, i. e. *on the day* (in question), *at that time*, but also *on this day*, i. e. *to-day*, or finally *by day*, equivalent to יוֹמָם, like עָרֵב *at evening*, לַיְלָה *noctu*, בֹּקֶר *in the morning, early*, Ps. 5, 4 and elsewhere, צַהֲרַיִם *at noonday*, Ps. 91, 6; comp. also יוֹם אֶחָד *on one and the same day*, Gen. 27, 45; also שָׁנָא *in sleep*, Ps. 127, 2; תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׁעָרִים (*Qrē* 'בִּת') *at the beginning of barley harvest*, 2 Sam. 21, 9; in stating a date, Gen. 11, 10, 14, 4 *in the thirteenth year*.

- k (δ) In answer to the question *how long?* e. g. Gen. 3, 14 and

¹ In Ps. 2, 12 דֶּרֶךְ is not to be taken as an *accus. loci* (*on the way*), but as an *accus. of respect* (*with regard to the way*); see below, letter m.

elsewhere, כָּל־יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ *all the days of thy life*; 7, 4 *forty days and forty nights*; 7, 24. 14, 4. 15, 13. 21, 34. 29, 18. Ex. 20, 9 (*for six days*); 23, 15. 31, 17; עוֹלָמִים *for ever*, 1 Ki. 8, 13; also with the accusative made determinate, Ex. 13, 7 שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים *throughout the seven days* in question, mentioned immediately before; comp. Jud. 14, 17. Deut. 9, 25.

4. The accusative is sometimes used of abstract ideas to state the reason (*accus. causae*), e.g. Is. 7, 25 *thou shalt not come thither* יִרְאַת שָׁמִיר *for fear of briars*.

5. Finally the accusative is used very variously (as an *accus. adverbialis* in the narrower sense), in order to describe more precisely the manner in which an action or condition takes place. In English such accusatives are mostly rendered by *in, with, as, in the form or manner of . . .*, according to, in relation to, with regard to. For more convenient classification we may distinguish them as—

(a) Adjectives expressing condition, placed after the verb to describe more accurately some bodily or other external state, e.g. Is. 20, 2 *walking naked and barefoot*; comp. verse 3. 8, 21. Gen. 15, 2. 33, 18 (שָׁרִים). Jud. 8, 4. Mic. 1, 8. Ps. 15, 2 (unless חָסִידִים be a substantive and directly dependent on הוֹלֵךְ = *he that walketh in uprightness*); 107, 5. Job 30, 28; after an accusative, e.g. Deut. 15, 18; to specify some mental state, e.g. Gen. 37, 35 (אֲבִל).—Before the verb (and then with a certain emphasis), Am. 2, 16. Job 1, 21. Eccles. 5, 14; Lev. 20, 20. Job 19, 25. 27, 19. 31, 26 (unless יָקָר be a substantive); Ruth 1, 21 (חֶסֶד parallel with the adverb יָקָר). In Mic. 2, 7 the text is clearly corrupt.

Those examples are especially instructive in which the adjective expressing condition, although referring to several, is nevertheless used in the singular, e.g. Job 24, 10 *naked, i.e. in the condition of one naked, they go about*; comp. verse 7; in 12, 17 and Is. 20, 4 the singular occurs after a plural object. This construction clearly proves that the term expressing the condition is not conceived as being in apposition, but as an indeclinable adverb.

(b) Participles, again either after the verb, Gen. 49, 11. Num. 16, 27. 1 Sam. 2, 18. Jer. 2, 27. 43, 2. Ps. 7, 3. Job 24, 5. Cant. 2, 8, or before it, Ex. 3, 18. Is. 57, 19. Ezek. 36, 35. Ps. 56, 2. 92, 14. Prov. 20, 14; comp. also the substantival use of the participles Niph'al נִרְאֶה *in a fearful manner* (Ps. 139, 14) and Niphal נִפְלְאוֹת *in a wonderful manner*, Job 37, 5. Dan. 8, 24.—Also participles in connexion with genitives, as מוֹתֵהוּ Gen. 3, 8 (comp. also בָּאָה 1 Ki. 14, 6), are to be regarded as expressing a condition and not as being in apposition, since in the latter case they would have to take the article.—In 2 Sam. 13, 20. 1 Ki. 7, 7 and Hab. 2, 10 the explicative Wāw (equivalent to the German *und swar*) is also prefixed to the participle. In Ps. 69, 4 for מִיָּחַל read מִיָּחַל.

(c) Substantives¹ in the most varied relations: thus, as describing an external

¹ Comp. above, § 100. c, on certain substantives which have completely become adverbs; and § 113. h and k on the adverbial use of the infinitive absolute.

condition, e.g. Mic. 2, 3 **וְלֹא תֵלְכוּ רוּחָה** *neither shall ye walk haughtily* (as opposed to **שָׂחוֹת** Is. 60, 14); Lev. 6, 9 (accus. before the verb = as *unleavened cakes*), Deut. 2, 9. 4, 11. Jud. 5, 21. Is. 57, 2. Prov. 7, 10. Job 31, 26. Lam. 1, 9; as stating the position of a disease, 1 Ki. 15, 23 *he was diseased* **אֶת־רִגְלָיו** in *his feet* (2 Chron. 16, 12 **בְּרִגְלָיו**), analogous to the cases discussed in § 117. 11 and § 121. *d* (*d*); as describing a spiritual, mental, or moral condition, e.g. Num. 32, 14. Jos. 9, 2 **כָּה אֶחָד** *with one accord*, 1 Ki. 22, 13; comp. Ex. 24, 3. Zeph. 3, 9), 1 Sam. 15, 32. 2 Sam. 23, 3. Jer. 31, 7. Hos. 12, 15. 14, 5. Ps. 56, 3. 58, 2. 75, 3. Prov. 31, 9. Job 16, 9. Lam. 1, 9; Lev. 19, 16, &c., in the expression **הָלַךְ רָכִיל** *to go up and down as a tale-bearer*; also **בְּטָח** *unawares*, Gen. 34, 25. Ezek. 30, 9; **כִּישְׁרִים** *uprightly*, Ps. 58, 2. 75, 3 (in both places *before* the verb); as stating the age, e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 33 (if the text be right) **יָמָתוּ אַנְשֵׁם** *they shall die as men*, i.e. when they be men; comp. 1 Sam. 2, 18 (**נָעַר**). Is. 65, 20, and Gen. 15, 16; as specifying the number more accurately, e.g. Jer. 13, 19 **שְׁלֹמִים** *wholly*; comp. Deut. 4, 27. 2 Ki. 5, 2. Jer. 31, 8; as stating the consequence of the action, Lev. 15, 18, &c.

- r* The description of the external or internal condition may follow, in poetry, in the form of a comparison with some well-known class, e.g. Is. 21, 8 **אֶקְרָא אַרְיֵה** *and he cried as a lion*; comp. Ps. 22, 14. Is. 22, 18 (**כִּדְרֵר** *like a ball*); Is. 24, 22. Zech. 2, 8. Ps. 11, 1 (unless **צִפּוֹר** be vocative); 58, 9 *b* (unless the force of the preceding **כִּי** is carried on, as in Ps. 90, 4); Ps. 144, 12. Job 24, 5 (**כִּפְתָּח**, before the verb); 41, 7 *shut up together as with a close seal*¹.

- s* 6. To the expressions describing condition belong finally those nouns which are introduced by the comparative particle **כִּי**², since the **כִּי** is to be regarded as originally a substantive³ in the sense of *amount, kind (instar)*, standing in the accusative (so that **כִּי** is equivalent to *as a kind of, after the manner of, according to*), while the following noun represents a genitive governed by the **כִּי**. From this, which is the proper meaning of the **כִּי**, may be explained its power of representing a great many pregnant relations, which in English

¹ It is, as a matter of fact, permissible to speak of the above examples as *comparatio decurtata*, but it must not be assumed that the comparative particle **כִּי**, which is otherwise regularly prefixed (see letter *s*), has actually dropped out.

² On the use of **כִּי** as a prefix, cf. § 102. *c*.

³ Schwabe (*נַחַשׁ nach seinem Wesen und Gebrauch im alttestam. Kanon gewürdigt*, Halle, 1883) has recently again contested this explanation (which is defended especially by Fleischer). He, with Gesenius and Ewald, places **כִּי** as a preposition on the same footing as **כִּי** and **כִּי**, and believes it to be probably connected with the stem **כָּן** as well as with **כִּי** and **כִּי**. The above view of **כִּי** as a substantive of course does not imply that the language as we have it is still in every case conscious of the substantival meaning.—On **כִּי** in numerical statements, in the sense of *about, nearly*, see the Lexicon.

can only be rendered by the help of prepositions¹. Thus the comparison may refer to—

(a) The *place*, e.g. Is. 5, 17 *בְּרִבְרֵם* after the manner of, i.e. as in their pasture; *t* 23, 15 as (it is said) in the song of the harlot; 28, 21. 29, 7 *בְּחִלּוֹם* as in a dream.

(b) The *time*, especially in the connexion *בְּיוֹם* after the manner of the day, *u* equivalent to *as in the day*, Is. 9, 3. Hos. 2, 5; *בְּיָמַי* as in the days . . . , Is. 51, 9. Hos. 2, 17. 9, 9. 12, 10. Am. 9, 11; comp., moreover, Lev. 22, 13. Is. 17, 6. Job 5, 14. 29, 2, and the expressions *בְּיוֹם בְּיוֹם* as day by day = as in former days, 1 Sam. 18, 10; *בְּפַעַם בְּפַעַם* as at other times, 1 Sam. 3, 10, &c.; *בְּשָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה* as in former years, 2 Ki. 17, 4; cf. § 123. c. Of a different character is the use of *בְּ* as a simple particle of time, e.g. Gen. 18, 10 *בְּעֵת חִיָּהָ* at this time (not about the time), when it lives again, i.e. at the end of a year; *בְּעֵת מָחָר* to-morrow at this time; comp. Is. 23, 5, and the frequent connexion of *בְּ* with the infinitive construct to express a definite time, Gen. 12, 14. 27, 34. Ex. 9, 29, &c.

(c) The *person*, e.g. Gen. 34, 31 *should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?* *v*

(d) The *thing*, e.g. Is. 10, 14. Ps. 33, 7. Job 28, 5 *אֵשׁ בְּמֹרֶאֱשׁ* as a fire, i.e. as *w* it were by fire (comp. Is. 1, 25 *בְּבֹר* as with lye); Job 29, 23 *בְּמַטָּר* as for the rain (they waited for me); Job 38, 14 (as in a garment); 38, 30 *בְּאֶבֶן* as to stone (the waters are contracted in freezing).

Rem. According to the earlier grammarians, *בְּ* is sometimes used pleonastically, *x* i.e. not to indicate a similarity (as in Lev. 14, 35 as it were, i.e. something like), but simply to introduce the predicate (*Kaph veritatis*), e.g. Neh. 7, 2 *for he was faithful* *אֱמִישׁ אֱמִישׁ* a faithful man; cf. 1 Sam. 20, 3 *בְּפִשְׁעִי*, Lam. 1, 20 *בְּפִנּוֹת*. Such a pleonasm is of course out of the question. At the most a *Kaph veritatis* can only be admitted in the sense that the comparison is sometimes introduced by *בְּ* with a certain emphasis (equivalent to *in every respect like*); thus *אֱמִישׁ אֱמִישׁ* in Neh. 7, 2 means simply *of the nature of a faithful man*, i.e. as only a faithful man can be; comp. Num. 11, 1. Is. 1, 7. 13, 6. Hos. 4, 4. 5, 10. Ob. 11. Job 24, 14. 27, 7. Lam. 1, 20. 2, 4; also *בְּמַעַט* in such passages as Ps. 105, 12 *yea, very few*; but e.g. in Is. 1, 9 *only just, a very small* . . .

§ 119. *The Subordination of Nouns to the Verb by means of Prepositions.*

1. In general. As is the case with regard to the looser subordina- *a*
tion of nouns to the verbal idea (§ 118), so also their subordination
by means of prepositions is used to represent the more immediate

¹ It would be altogether unsuitable here also (see above, note on letter *r*) to assume a loss of the preposition. Such examples as Is. 1, 26 *בְּרִבְרֵם* and *בְּבִתְחִלָּה* (Lev. 26, 37 *בְּמִשְׁעָר*) are to be explained from the fact that here the preposition and substantive had already become simply *one* word before the *בְּ* was prefixed. We find also *בְּעַל* Is. 59, 18. 63, 7. Ps. 119, 14, and 2 Chron. 32, 19; cf. Driver on 1 Sam. 14, 14 (*בְּבִתְחִלָּה*), where the text is wholly corrupt.

circumstances (of place, time, cause, purpose, measure, association, or separation) under which an action or event is accomplished. In the case of most prepositions some idea of a relation of *space* underlies the construction, which then, in a wider sense, is extended to the ideas of time, motive, or other relations conceived by the mind.

On the origin of the prepositions and the original case-relation in which they stand to the nouns governed by them, comp. § 101, where a list of the prepositions is given with their original meanings. Comp. also § 102 on the prefixes, and § 103 on the union of prepositions with suffixes.

- b 2. A not unimportant part is played in Hebrew by the *compounding* of prepositions to represent more accurately the relations of place, which may either precede or follow the action. In the former case מִן, and in the latter (which is not so frequent) אַחֲרֵי occurs before other prepositions of place; comp. e. g. Amos 7, 15 *the Lord took me* מֵאַחֲרֵי הָעֶמְקַי *from behind the flock*; 2 Ki. 9, 18 *turn thee* אַחֲרֵי מֵאֵל *to behind me*, i. e. *turn thee behind me*; מֵעִם מֵאֵת *from with . . .*, as in French *de chez, d'auprès, quelqu'un*¹. For further examples, see letter c.

- c Rem. 1. We must *not* regard as combined prepositions in the above sense either those *substantives* which have become prepositions only by their union with prefixes, as לִפְנֵי *before*, מִפְּנֵי, מִפְּנֵי, לְמַעַן *on account of* (but e. g. מִלְּפָנַי *from before*, Gen. 4, 16, &c., is such a compound); nor *adverbs*, which are also formed by combining words which were originally substantives (also used as prepositions) with prepositions, as מִחוּץ *without*, מִתַּחַת *in the sense of below*², מֵעַל *above*

¹ In other cases French, as well as English and German, can only emphasize one of the two combined ideas; thus, such expressions as *il prend le chapeau sur la table*, German and English *er nimmt den Hut vom Tisch*, *he takes his hat from the table*, all regard the action from one point of view only; the Hebrew here brings out both aspects of it by means of מֵעַל *from upon*, comp. e. g. Is. 6, 6.

² Hence not to be confounded with מִתַּחַת *from under*, in such examples as Prov. 22, 27, which is a real compound preposition. In the above-mentioned adverbs also the מִן was *originally* by no means pleonastic; מִתַּחַת denotes properly the locality, regarded primarily as a place *from beneath* which something proceeds, and so on. This original sense of the מִן, however, has become so much obscured by its regular combination with words of place to form independent adverbs, that it is even prefixed (evidently only on the analogy of such common adverbs as מֵעַל, מִתַּחַת) in cases where it is really inadmissible, owing to the meaning of the adverb, e. g. in מִלְּפָנַי, מִלְּבַד, מִלְּבַד *without*, comp. also such examples as מִלְּפָנַי, מִלְּפָנַי, מִלְּפָנַי, מִלְּפָנַי (there), &c. Since a מִן is not usually repeated after מִלְּבַד, it appears as if מִלְּבַד by a transposition of the מִן stood for the usual לְבַד מִן. In reality, however, the preposition which forms the adverb into a preposition is omitted here, as in מֵעַל, מִתַּחַת, without a following ל (see above). Properly מִלְּבַד has a purely adverbial meaning = *taken*

(so also in Gen. 27, 39, 49, 25, not from above). These adverbs of place, however, may become prepositions by the addition of ל, e.g. מחוץ ל outside as regards . . . , i.e. outside of something; מתחת ל below as regards . . . , i.e. under something (cf. עד-מתחת ל until they came under . . . , 1 Sam. 7, 11), מעל ל over something, &c.; לבר ל prop. in separation מן לבר in separation from, i.e. apart from, besides. Only rarely in such a case is the ל omitted for the sake of brevity, e.g. Job 26, 5 מתחת מים beneath the waters; Neh. 3, 28 (מעל).

2. Real combinations of prepositions (each retaining its full force) occur—

(a) With מן, in מאחר מן (see above) from behind something; מאחז מן from with (see above); מבינן or מבינות from between something (with motion in either direction, see e.g. Gen. 49, 10); מלפני מן from before (see above); sometimes also מכול מן Lev. 5, 8 and elsewhere; מעל מן from upon, i.e. up from; מתחת מן away from under (see foot-note 2, on p. 396).

(β) With אל, in אחרי אל to behind, בינות אל to between; אלהי מביית ל forth between, 2 Ki. 11, 15; אלהי מחוץ ל forth without, i.e. out in front of, Num. 5, 3; אלהי תחת ל down under¹.—In Job 5, 5 the two prepositions of motion are combined in a peculiarly pregnant construction, אל מוצניח (he goes thither and takes it) out of the thorns, i.e. he taketh it even out of the thorns.

3. A general view of the union of certain verbs, or whole classes of verbs, with particular prepositions, especially in explanation of certain idioms and pregnant expressions².

(a) אל (אלהי) towards, properly an expression of motion or at least direction towards something (either in the sense of up to = עד, or into = אל-תוך), is used after verbs not only in answer to the question *whither?* but by a specially pregnant construction, in answer to the question *where?* e.g. Jer. 41, 12 they found him אל-מים רבים by the great waters; comp. Deut. 16, 6. 1 Ki. 13, 20, and a still more remarkable instance in 8, 30 אל-השמים שבתך אל-השמים. This combination of two different ideas, of motion to a place and being or acting in the place (very plainly seen in Deut. 16, 6 but to the place which the Lord thy God shall choose . . . shalt thou bring thine offering and there shalt thou sacrifice, &c.), is the same as the Greek use of εἰς, ἐς for ἐν, the Latin in potestatem, in amicitiam ditionemque esse, manere (Cic. Verr. 5, 38; Div. 2, 14, and elsewhere); cf. also the common German expressions zu Hause, zu Leipzig sein, zu Bette liegen, &c.

by itself, like מעל, מלמעלה (Syriac men le'el) above (adv.), as distinguished from מעל ל or מעל-ל (Syriac le'el men) over, upon something.—Also מן from . . . onward is not for מן, but the ל serves merely (just like the Latin usque in usque a, usque ad, usque ex) to indicate expressly the starting-point in question, as an exact terminus a quo (of place or time).

¹ Also in 1 Sam. 21, 5 אל-תחת ל by a pregnant construction is virtually dependent on the idea of coming into, contained in the preceding אין.

² A summary of all the relations and senses in which a preposition may be used, belongs not to the Grammar but to the Lexicon.

³ Cf. Mitchell, 'The preposition el,' in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1888, p. 143 sqq.

e.g. הֶאֱמִין בְּ *to trust in* (to cleave trustingly *to*) somebody or something; בְּטַח בְּ *to have confidence in* . . . ; שָׂמַח בְּ *to rejoice in or at* something, &c.; דִּבֶּר בְּ *to speak of (about)* some one or something, Deut. 6, 7. 1 Sam. 19, 3 sq. &c.

(4) The idea of an action as extending *to* something, with at the same time the secondary idea of participation *in* something, underlies finally the *partitive* use of בְּ , e.g. בְּאָכַל *to share in eating* something, Ex. 12, 43 sqq. Lev. 22, 11; also simply *to eat, to taste of* something, Jud. 13, 16. Job 21, 25; so also בְּלָחַם *to eat of*, and בְּשִׁתָּה *to drink of* something, Prov. 9, 5; בְּשִׁמְעַע *to hear a whisper of* something, Job 26, 14; בְּנִשָּׂא *to bear a share of* something, Num. 11, 17. Ezek. 18, 20. Job 7, 13. Comp. also בְּהָלַק *to give a share of* something, Job 39, 17; בְּנָה *to do building to*, Neh. 4, 4.

(5) With the idea of *touching, striking against anything* is naturally connected that of proximity and vicinity *near*, and further that of association *with* something; comp. Gen. 9, 4 בְּנִפְשׁוֹ *with the life thereof*; 15, 14. 32, 11 בְּמַסְלִי *with my staff*. Sometimes בְּ combined with a verb of motion (*to come with* something) expresses the idea of *bringing*, e.g. Jud. 15, 1 *Samson visited his wife with a kid*, i.e. he brought her a kid; Deut. 23, 5. 1 Chron. 15, 19 sqq. 16, 6.

(6) From the idea of connexion with something, being accompanied by something (see letter *n*), is developed, finally, the *instrumental* use of בְּ , which represents the means or instrument (or even the personal agent), as something *with which* one has associated himself in order to perform an action; comp. Mic. 4, 14 בְּשִׁבְטָם *they smite with the rod*; Is. 10, 24; Ps. 18, 30 בְּךָ *by thee* (so also 44, 6, parallel with בְּשִׁבְטֶךָ); Is. 10, 34. Hos. 1, 7. 12, 14; comp. also בְּעֵבֶר *to labour by means of* some one, i.e. to cause him to labour at it, Ex. 1, 14 and elsewhere. On בְּ with the passive to introduce the means or the author, see § 121. *f*.

A variety of the בְּ *instrumenti* is בְּ *pretii* (the price being considered as the means of acquiring a thing), comp. Gen. 23, 9. 29, 18 בְּדָרְחָל ; 30, 16. 33, 19. 34, 15 בְּזֹאת *on this condition*; 37, 28; also, in a wider sense, Gen. 18, 28 בְּ *for the sake of*; 29, 18. 1 Sam. 3, 13.

Rem. The use of בְּ *instrumenti* to introduce the object is peculiar in such expressions as Ps. 44, 20 *and thou coveredst over us with the shadow of death*; Job 16, 10 $\text{בְּפִיהֶם עָלַי פָּעְרוּ}$ *they have opened wide their mouth against me* (prop. *have made an opening with their mouth*); comp. Ps. 22, 8. Ex. 7, 20 *he lifted up the rod*; Jos. 8, 18. Lam. 1, 17. Analogous to some English expressions we find both *to gnash the teeth*, Ps. 35, 16, and *to gnash with the teeth*, Job 16, 9; *to wink the eye*, Prov. 10, 10, and *to wink with the eye*, Prov. 6, 13; so *to shake the head*, Ps. 22, 8, and *to shake with the head*, Jer. 18, 16. Job 16, 4.—In all these instances the verb (intransitive) construed with בְּ has a greater independence, and consequently more emphasis than the verb construed with a direct accusative; the latter conveys a sort of necessary specification of the action, while the noun introduced by בְּ is used rather as a merely adverbial

¹ To be distinguished from בְּשִׁתָּה = *to drink from* (a cup, &c., Gen. 44, 5. Amos 6, 6), as in Arabic and Aramaic (Dan. 5, 2). Comp. also $\epsilon\nu\ \omega\sigma\pi\eta\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (Xen. Anab. 6, 1, 4), $\epsilon\nu\ \chi\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\ \pi\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ (3 Ezra 3, 6), *in ossibus bibere* in Florus, and the French *boire dans une tasse*.

complement. An instructive example of this is קל נהן קל *vocem emittere, to utter a voice*, also *to thunder*, while in נהן בקולו Ps. 46, 7 (68, 34. Jer. 12, 8), נהן has an independent sense = *he thundered with his voice* (i. e. mightily).

- ^r (c) ל¹ *to*, a very general expression of *direction towards* anything, is used to represent the most varied *relations* of an action or condition with regard to a person or thing. On the use of ל as a periphrasis for the *genetivus possessoris* or *auctoris* (the idea of belonging to), see § 129; on ל with the passive, to introduce the author or the cause, see § 121. f; on ל in a purely local sense (e. g. לימיניך *at thy right hand*, prop. *towards thy right hand*), or temporal (e. g. לערב *at evening*, &c.) or distributive, see the Lexicon.

The following uses of ל properly belong to the government of the verb:

- ^s (1) As a *nota dativi*² to introduce the remoter object; also
 (2) To introduce the *dativus commodi*. This *dativus commodi* (or *incommodi*, e. g. Ezek. 37, 11) is used—especially in colloquial language and in later style—in the form of a pronoun with ל, as an apparently pleonastic *dativus ethicus*, with many verbs, in order to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question for a particular subject. In this construction the person of the pronoun must always agree with that of the verbal form³. By far the most frequent use of this ל is with the pronoun of the 2nd person after imperatives, e. g. לך־הֵן *go, get thee away*, Gen. 12, 1. 22, 2. Deut. 2, 13 (also in the feminine, Cant. 2, 10. 13); לך־נָסוּה *turn thee aside*, 2 Sam. 2, 21; לָכֶם קַעוֹ *take your journey*, Deut. 1, 7; לָכֶם עֲבֹדוּ *pass ye over*; לָךְ בְּרַח־לְךָ *flee!* (to save thyself), Gen. 27, 43; עֲלֵי־לָךְ *get thee up*, Is. 40, 9; לָכֶם פֹּנֵה *turn you*, Deut. 1, 40; לָכֶם שֹׁבוּ *return ye*, Deut. 5, 27; לָךְ קָמִי *rise up*, Cant. 2, 10; לָכֶם שֹׁבוּ *abide ye*, Gen. 22, 5; לָךְ חִל־לְךָ *forbear thee*, 2 Chron. 35, 21 (in the plural, Is. 2, 22); לָכֶם הִשְׁמַר לָךְ *take heed to yourselves* (see above, § 51. n) *cave tibi!* and לָכֶם הִשְׁמַר *take heed to yourselves*; לָךְ דָּמָה *be thou like*, Cant. 2, 17 (cf. verse 9). 8, 14, is remarkable; after a perfect consecutive, 1 Ki. 17, 3. 1 Sam. 22, 5; after an imperfect consecutive, e. g. Is. 36, 9 לָךְ וַתִּבְטַח *and putteth thy trust*.—In the 3rd person, e. g. לָהּ וַתֵּשֶׁב *and sat her down*, Gen. 21, 16; comp. Ex. 18, 26. Ps. 120, 6. 123, 4. Job 6, 19; even after a participle, Hos. 8, 9.—In the 1st person plural, Ezek. 37, 11.
- ^t (3) To introduce the result after verbs of making, forming, changing, appointing to something, esteeming as something; in short, in all those cases in which, according to § 117. ii, a second *accusative* may also be used.
- ^u (4) In loose connexion with some verbal idea in the sense of *in reference to*, *with regard to* . . . (§ 143. e); so after a *verbum dicendi*, Gen. 20, 13; after a circumstantial expression, 1 Ki. 10, 23; comp. Is. 36, 9; even before the verb, Jer. 9, 2.—To the same class belongs also the *Lamedh inscriptionis* (untranslatable

¹ Comp. Giesebrecht, *Die hebr. Präpos. Lamed*, Halle, 1876.

² Just as in the Romance languages the Latin preposition *ad* (Italian *a*, before vowels *ad*, French *à*, Spanish *a*) and in English *to* are used as a periphrasis for the dative.—On the introduction of the nearer object by ל, cf. § 117. n.

³ Such expressions as the analogous English *he plucked me ope his doublet, but me no buts*, and the like, are accordingly inadmissible in Hebrew.

in English, and hardly more than a mere quotation-mark) which introduces the exact wording of an inscription or title; thus Is. 8, 1 *write upon it* . . . (the words) מִהַר שָׁלֵל וְנֹר (comp. verse 3, where the ל naturally is not used); Ezek. 37, 16.

(d) מִן, originally (according to § 101. a) prop. *separation*¹, represents both *v* the idea of *distance, separation* or *remoteness from* something, and that of *motion away from* something, hence also *descent, origin from* a place, Amos 1, 1.

(1) From the idea of *separation* is naturally derived on the one hand the sense *w* of (taken) *from among* . . . , e.g. Gen. 3, 1 *subtil as none other of the beasts*, &c.; comp. 3, 14. Deut. 33, 24. 1 Sam. 15, 33. Jud. 5, 24 (so especially after the idea of choosing *out of*² a larger class, 1 Sam. 2, 28; comp. Ex. 19, 5 and elsewhere), and on the other hand, the sense of *without* (separated, free from . . .), e.g. Is. 22, 3 מִסֵּת אֶפְרַיִם *without the bow* (i.e. without one needing to bend a bow against them) *they were made prisoners*; comp. Jer. 48, 45 מִכֹּחַ *without strength*; Mic. 3, 6. Job 11, 15. 19, 26. 21, 9, also such examples as Num. 15, 24 *far from the eyes*, i.e. unobserved by the congregation; Prov. 20, 3.

Here also belongs the use of מִן after the ideas of *restraining, withholding from*, *x* *refusing* to any one, frequently in pregnant expressions, which we can render only by complete final or consecutive clauses, e.g. 1 Sam. 15, 23 *he hath rejected thee away from* (being) *king*, instead of מִהְיוֹת מֶלֶךְ (as in verse 26), *that thou be no longer king*; comp. 1 Ki. 15, 13. Is. 17, 1 מִעִיר *so that it is no longer a city*; Jer. 17, 16. Job 28, 11 *he bindeth the streams* מִבְּכִי *that they trickle not*; Gen. 16, 2. 23, 6 מִקְבֹּר *that thou shouldst not bury thy dead*; Is. 24, 10.

The מִן has a still more pregnant force in those examples in which the idea of *y* precluding from anything is only indirectly contained in the preceding verb, e.g. Gen. 27, 1 *his eyes were dim* מִרְאֵת *away from seeing* i.e. *so that he could not see*; Is. 7, 8 *Ephraim shall be broken in pieces* מִעַם *that it be not a people* (just as in Is. 23, 1. Jer. 48, 2. 42. Ps. 83, 5); Lev. 26, 13. Is. 5, 6. 49, 15. 54, 9.

¹ Cf. O. Molin, *Om prepositionen min i Bibelhebreiskan*, Upsala, 1893, and especially N. Zerweck, *Die hebr. Praep. min*, Leipzig, 1893, who, instead of the partitive meaning (formerly accepted by us also), more correctly takes 'separation' as the starting-point of its various uses.

² All the *partitive* uses of מִן come under this idea of *separation out of* a larger class. Thus מִן is used in the sense of *some, something*, and even *one*, in such expressions as *and he slew . . . also* מִן מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (*divers*) *of the princes of Israel*, 2 Chron. 21, 4; מִן מִדְּלֵי Lev. 4, 2; 1 Ki. 18, 5; מִן דָּמַם הַבָּקָר *some of the blood of the bullock*, Ex. 29, 12 and elsewhere; Job 27, 6 *my heart doth not reproach me* מִמִּי *for any*, i.e. for one, *of my days*; 38, 12 מִיָּמֶיךָ *one of thy days*, i.e. *ever in thy life* (this explanation is confirmed by 1 Ki. 1, 6; comp. also 1 Sam. 14, 45. 25, 28). In this way also, the frequently misunderstood Hebrew (and Arabic) idiom is to be explained, by which מִן before אַחֵר is equivalent to *ullus*; e.g. Lev. 4, 2 *and shall do* מִן אֶחָת מֵהֵנָּה *any one of these things*; 5, 13. Deut. 15, 7. Ezek. 18, 10.—מִן is used in the sense of the Arabic *min el-beyān* or explicative *min* (often to be simply translated by *namely*), e.g. in Gen. 7, 22 *of all that was*, i.e. *so far as it was*, probably also Gen. 6, 2 (= *whomsoever they chose*).

Ezra 2, 62¹ (for other pregnant constructions with מִן see below, letter *f*); on מִן־לִּי and מִן־לִּי without, cf. § 152. *y*.

- z* (2) On the sense of *motion away from* anything depends the use of מִן after such ideas as *to go away from*, *to beware*, *to be afraid of*, *to flee*, *to escape*, *to hide oneself from* (comp. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta$, *custodire ab*), sometimes again in pregnant expressions, e.g. Is. 33, 15. On the idea of *starting from* anything depends finally the very frequent *causative* use of מִן *on account of*, *in consequence of* (comp. our *that comes from* . . .), *prae*, e.g. מִרְב for *multitude*, 1 Kl. 8, 3.

- aa* (e) עַל־ ². The two original local meanings of this preposition are *upon* ($\epsilon\pi\iota$)³ and *over* ($\overline{\epsilon}\pi\iota$, *super*).

(1) From the original meaning *upon* is explained the use of עַל־ after ideas of *commanding*, *commissioning* (מִשְׁכֵּר עַל־), &c., inasmuch as the command, obligation, &c. is *laid upon* the object. The construction is self-evident in the case of *to lie*, *rest*, *lean*, *rely*, *press upon* something; comp. also, for the last, such examples as Is. 1, 14. Job 7, 20. 23, 2 and especially 2 Sam. 18, 11 עָלַי prop. *upon me* would it have been, it would have been incumbent *upon me*, &c.

- bb* (2) From the original meaning *over* is explained the use of עַל־ after ideas of *covering*, *protecting*, *guarding* מִן־עַל־ , גָּן־עַל־ ; also the combinations רַחֵם עַל־ *to have compassion upon* . . ., חַסֵּם עַל־ , חָסַל עַל־ *to spare some one*, arise from the idea of a compassionate or protective *bending over* something. Comp. also נָלַחַם עַל־ Jud. 9, 17 = *to fight for some one*, i. e. in his defence.

- cc* (3) Moreover עַל־ is used after verbs of *standing* and *going*, to express a towering *over* some one or something, sometimes in phrases, in which the original local idea has altogether fallen into the background, and which are therefore to be rendered in English by means of other prepositions (*by*, *with*, *before*, *near*), e.g. Gen. 41, 1 and elsewhere, *Pharaoh . . . stood עַל־הַיָּאֵר* *by the Nile* (above the water level; comp. Ps. 1, 3), and so especially עָמַד עַל־ in the pregnant sense *to stand serving before some one* (prop. *over one who sits or reclines at table*) Zech. 4, 14 (comp. Is. 6, 2, where מִשְׁעַל־ is used for עַל־); הִתְרַצַּב עַל־ *to present oneself by command before some one*, Job 1, 6 and elsewhere. Comp. also עַל־יָד , עַל־יָדַי (Job 1, 14) *near, at (on) the side of some one or something*.

¹ On the use of מִן to express the comparative, which likewise depends on the idea of *distance from* . . ., comp. below, § 133. *a*; on מִן as expressing the distance of time from a fixed limit, in the sense of *after*, e.g. Ps. 73, 20 מִתְקִיץ *after awaking* (comp. $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, *ab itinere*), or *after the lapse of* . . ., e.g. Gen. 38, 24. Hos. 6, 2, and very frequently מִסֶּוֹף *from the end of* i. e. *after the lapse of* . . ., see the Lexicon; also for the use of מִן to represent *resting beside* anything, like the Latin *prope abesse ab* . . .

² Comp. Budie, *Die hebr. Präpos. 'Al* (עַל), Halle, 1882.

³ Since the placing *upon* anything is an addition to it, עַל־ also implies *in addition to* something, comp. Gen. 28, 9 (31, 50); 30, 40. 32, 12 (probably a proverbial saying = *mother and children*); Deut. 22, 6. Also עַל־ *notwithstanding* is no doubt properly *in addition to*, e.g. Job 10, 7 *although thou knowest*, prop. *in addition to thy knowing*.—From the original meaning *upon* is also derived that of *on account of* (prop. *upon the ground of*) and *in agreement with*, *according to*, since the pattern is regarded as the foundation *upon* which a thing stands or rests.

(4) From the original meaning *above* (not, as formerly explained, *on to* something, *ad* at something) there arise finally all the various constructions with *על* in the sense of *towards*, *against*. The original idea (which in many of these constructions has become wholly unrecognizable) starts from the view that the assailer endeavours to take up his position *over* the person attacked, so as to reach him from above, or to *overpower* him; comp. especially *על קים* *על* to rise up *over* i.e. *against* some one, then with a transference of thought applied to any kind of hostile approach, *נלחם על* to fight against . . . , *הנה על* to encamp against . . . , *נאסף על* to be gathered together, to assemble against (Mic. 4, 11; comp. Ps. 2, 2), &c.; even after verbs which express a mental action, e.g. *חשב רעה על* to imagine evil against any one, &c.

4. Sometimes a preposition appears to be under the immediate *ee* government of a verb, which, by its meaning, excludes such a union. In reality the preposition is dependent on a verb (generally a verb of motion), which, for the sake of brevity, is not expressed, but in sense is contained in what is apparently the governing verb.

Various examples of this *constructio praeagnans* have been already noticed above *ff* in letters *x* and *y* under *מן*; for *מן* comp. also Ps. 22, 22 *אֶפְרָיִם רָמִים מִן* and thou hast answered and saved me from the horns of the wild oxen (in Is. 38, 17, which Delitzsch translates by *thou hast loved and delivered my soul from the pit*, read *חֲשַׁבְתָּ* with the LXX); Gen. 25, 23. 2 Sam. 18, 19. Job 28, 12; comp. also *מִן* Ps. 73, 27 to go a whoring from any one i.e. to be unfaithful to him; *רָשַׁע מִן* Ps. 18, 22 = to depart wickedly from God; *חָרַשׁ מִן* Ps. 28, 1 to be silent from one (to turn away in silence); comp. Job 13, 13.

Pregnant constructions with *אַחֲרַי* : Num. 14, 24 equivalent to *יָמְלָא לְלֶכֶת אַחֲרַי* *gg* and he made full to walk i.e. walked fully after me; 1 Sam. 13, 7 *חָרְדוּ אַחֲרָיו* they trembled after him i.e. went after him trembling; with *אֵל* Gen. 43, 33 *דָּרַשׁ אֵל* to turn in astonishment to some one (comp. Is. 13, 8); *דָּרַשׁ אֵל* Is. 11, 10 and elsewhere, to turn inquiringly to some one; *חָרַשׁ אֵל* Is. 41, 1 to turn in silence to some one; *חָרַד אֵל* Gen. 42, 28 to turn trembling to some one (comp. *לִפְרֹאֵת לְחָרַד* to come trembling to meet, 1 Sam. 21, 2); comp. further Jer. 41, 7. Ps. 7, 7. 2 Chron. 32, 1; with *בָּ* Ps. 55, 19 *הֵאֱחָדָה בָּ* he hath redeemed and hath put my soul in peace, exactly like Ps. 118, 5; with *לְ* Ps. 74, 7 *הֵאֱחָדָה לְ* profaned and cast . . . even to the ground; comp. 89, 40.

5. In poetic parallelism the governing power of a preposition *hh* is sometimes extended to the corresponding substantive of the second member; e.g. *בָּ* Is. 40, 19. 48, 14 *הֵאֱחָדָה בָּ* he shall perform his pleasure on Babylon, and his arm shall be *בְּיָדָיו* (for *בְּיָדָיו*) on the Chaldeans; Job 15, 3; *לְ* Is. 28, 6. Ezek. 39, 4. Job 34, 10 (perhaps also Gen.

¹ Similarly the force of a negative is sometimes extended to the parallel member; see § 152. 2.

45, 8; מִשָּׁל may, however, be regarded here as a second accusative according to § 117. ii; לְמַעַן Is. 48, 9; כִּי Is. 58, 13. Ps. 141, 9; עַד Is. 15, 8; תָּחַת Is. 61, 7.

- ii 6. Adverbs which have acquired a substantival value are sometimes governed by prepositions, e.g. אַל־חֲנָם *in vain*, Ezek. 6, 10; אַחֲרָיו *after this*; כֵּן (Eccles. 8, 10. Est. 4, 16) *then*; לָכֵן and עַל־כֵּן *therefore*; עַד־כֵּן *hitherto*.

§ 120. *Verbal Ideas under the Government of a Verb. Co-ordination of Complementary Verbal Ideas.*

- a 1. When a *relative* verb (incomplete in itself) receives its necessary complement in the form of a verbal idea, the latter is, as a rule, subordinated in the infinitive construct (with or without לְ), less frequently in the infinitive absolute, in a few instances in the form of a participle (or verbal adjective), or finally in the imperfect without the copula. In these combinations the principal idea is very frequently represented by the subordinate member of the sentence, whilst the governing verb rather contains a mere definition of the manner of the action; comp. letters *d* and *g* below, and § 114. n, note 3.
- b (a) On the subordination of an infinitive construct as an accusative of the object, and as the complement of relative verbal ideas, see above, § 114. c, and the numerous examples given in § 114. m; on the infinitive absolute as object, see § 113. d.—The complement in the form of a participle (as in Greek, and also frequently in Syriac) occurs in Is. 33, 1 בְּהִתְחַמְדֵּךְ שׁוֹדֵד *(comp. for the form, § 67. v) when thou hast ceased as a spoiler, i.e. to spoil*; Jer. 22, 30 לֹא יִצְלַח . . . יֹשֵׁב *he shall never prosper, sitting, i.e. so as to sit, &c.*; Jon. 1, 6 מַה תֵּשֶׁב *what meanest thou, sleeping? i.e. that thou sleepest¹*; by a verbal adjective, 1 Sam. 3, 2 עַתָּה כְּהוֹת עֵינָיו *had begun as dim, i.e. to wax dim*.
- c (b) Examples of the subordination of the complementary verbal idea in the imperfect² (in English usually rendered by *to, in order to or that*) are—(1) with both verbs in the same person: after the perfect, Is. 42, 21 יִגְדִּיל . . . יְהוָה חֲפִצִּי *it pleased the Lord . . . to magnify, &c.*; Job 32, 22 לֹא יֵדְעוּתִי אֲכַבֶּה *I know not to give flattering titles*; after a perfect consecutive, 1 Sam. 20, 19 (where for תִּרְדּוּ we should read with the LXX תִּפְקְדוּ); after an imperfect, Ps. 88, 11. 102, 14.

¹ In יֵדְעוּתִי 1 Sam. 16, 16, which appears to be a case of this kind, two different readings are combined, יֵדְעוּתִי and the simple מֵנִי.

² This kind of subordination is frequent in Arabic and in Syriac (comp. e.g. the Peshittâ, Luke 18, 13); as a rule, however, a conjunction (corresponding to our *that*) is inserted. Comp. moreover, the Latin *quid vis faciam?* Terence; *volo hoc oratori contingat*, Cicero, Brut. 84; and our *I would it were; I thought he would go*.

Job 19, 3. 24, 14.—(2) with a difference in the persons: after a perfect, Lev. 9, 6 *this is the thing* *הַזֶּה הַתַּעֲשֶׂה* *which the Lord commanded* (that) *ye should do*; a negative imperfect follows *אֵינָה* in Lam. 1, 10; after the imperfect, Is. 47, 1 (5) *לֹא תִקְרְאֶינִי עוֹד* *for thou shalt no more continue* (that) *they call thee*, i. e. thou shalt no longer be called, &c.; Num. 22, 6 *peradventure I shall prevail* (that) *we may smite them*, and (that) *I may drive them out of the land* (*אֶחְבֹּל* may, however, be a scribal error for *נֶחֱבֵל*, due to the preceding *אֶחְבֹּל*, and in that case the example would belong to No. 1); after a participle, 2 Sam. 21, 4.—A perfect is possibly subordinated in Lam. 1, 10; but the explanation of *בְּמֵת* as a relative clause is preferable.

2. Instead of subordination (as in the cases mentioned in letters *a-c*), *d* the co-ordination of the complementary verbal idea in the form of a finite verb (cf. above, letter *c*) frequently occurs, either—

(a) With the second verb co-ordinated in a form exactly corresponding to the first (but see below, letter *e*) by means of *וְ* (*1*, *2*)¹. As a rule, here also (see above, letter *a*) the principal idea is introduced only by the second verb, while the first (especially *וְשָׁב*, *וְיָסַף*, *וְהוֹסִיף*) contains the definition of the manner of the action, e. g. Gen. 26, 18 *וַיִּחְפֹּר וַיִּשְׁב* *and he returned and dugged*, i. e. he dugged again; 2 Ki. 1, 11. 13; in the perfect consecutive, Is. 6, 13; with *וְהוֹסִיף*, e. g. Gen. 25, 1 *and Abraham added and took a wife*, i. e. again took a wife; Gen. 38, 5 and frequently; with *וְחָל* Gen. 9, 20; with *וְהוֹאִיל* in the jussive, Job 6, 9; in the imperative (comp. § 110. *h*), Jud. 19, 6 *וְהוֹאִיל־נָא וְלִין* *be content, I pray thee, and tarry all night* (comp. the English *he was persuaded, and remained for to remain*); 2 Sam. 7, 29; with *וְסָהַר* Gen. 24, 18. 20 and elsewhere; with *וְפָרַד* Cant. 2, 3.

Rem. 1. Instead of an exact agreement between co-ordinate verbal forms, other combinations sometimes occur, viz. imperfect and perfect consecutive (comp. § 112. *d*), e. g. Deut. 31, 12 *וְיָרְאוּ אֶת-יְהוָה וְיִלְמְדוּ* *may learn, and fear the Lord*, i. e. *to fear the Lord*; Is. 1, 19. Hos. 2, 11. Est. 8, 6. Dan. 9, 25 *b*; perfect and imperfect, Job 23, 3 (*O that I knew how I might find him*); perfect and imperfect consecutive, Jos. 7, 7. Eccles. 4, 1. 7; jussive and imperative, Job 17, 10; comp., finally, Gen. 47, 6 *וְאִם-יִדְעֶתָ וְיִשְׁפָּח* *and if thou knowest and there are among them, &c.*, i. e. that there are among them.

¹ Comp. the English colloquial expression *I will try and do it*.

² Of a different kind are the cases in which *וְיָסַף* with a negative is co-ordinated with a verb to emphasize the non-recurrence of the action; cf. Num. 11, 25 *they prophesied and added not*, sc. *to prophesy*, i. e. *but they did so no more*; Deut. 5, 19. Job 27, 19 (reading *וְלֹא יִאֲסִיף*).

f 2. Special mention must be made of the instances in which the natural complement of the first verb is suppressed, or is added immediately after in the form of an historical statement, e.g. Gen. 42, 25 *then Joseph commanded and they filled*¹ (prop. that they should fill, and they filled . . .; comp. the full form of expression in Gen. 50, 2); a further command is then added by means of *וְ* and the infinitive; Ex. 36, 6; another instance of the same kind is Gen. 30, 27 *I have divined and the Lord hath blessed me*, &c., i. e. that the Lord hath blessed me for thy sake.

g (b) With the second verb (which, according to the above, represents the principal idea) attached *without the copula*² in the same mood, &c. In this construction (cf. § 110. *h*) the imperatives קום (קומה), קומי, קומי, &c.) and לך (לכה), לכי, &c.) are exceedingly common in the form of interjections, before verbs which express a movement or other action, e.g. קום הַתְהַלֵּךְ *arise, walk*, Gen. 13, 17. 19, 15. 27, 43; in the plural, Gen. 19, 14; Ex. 19, 24 לך יֵרֵד *go, get thee down*; 1 Sam. 3, 9; with a following cohortative, 1 Sam. 9, 10 לכה גִּלְכָּה *come, let us go*; Gen. 31, 44 and frequently.—Also with הוֹסִיף, Hos. 1, 6 לֹא אֹסִיף עוֹד *I will not add further and have mercy*, i. e. will no longer have mercy; Is. 52, 1. Prov. 23, 35; שׁוּב (likewise a periphrasis for *again*) in the perfect, Zech. 8, 15; in the imperfect, Mic. 7, 19. Ps. 7, 13. 59, 7. 71, 20; in the jussive, Job 10, 16; in the cohortative, Gen. 30, 31; in the imperative, Jos. 5, 2. 1 Sam. 3, 5 *lie down again*; הוֹאִיל (sometimes to express the idea of *willingly* or *gladly*) in the perfect, Deut. 1, 5. Hos. 5, 11; in the imperative, Job 6, 28; הִרְבָּה = *much*, 1 Sam. 2, 3 אַל-תִּרְבוּ תִרְבוֹר עֲתָק *do not multiply and talk*, i. e. talk not so much *arrogancy*; in the imperative, Ps. 51, 4; הֵחֵל, Deut. 2, 24 רֵשׁ *begin, possess*; יָכַל, Lam. 4, 14 יָכְלוּ יָנֹעַ *without men's being able to touch*, &c.; בָּהֵר = *quickly*, in the perfect, Ps. 106, 13; in the imperative, Gen. 19, 22. Jud. 9, 48. Est. 6, 10.—Other examples are: Hos. 9, 9 הִעֲמִיק = *deeply, radically*; Zeph. 3, 7 הִשְׁקִיף = *early* (even in the participle, Hos. 6, 4. 13, 3); Is. 29, 4 שָׁפַל = *low*, comp. Jer. 13, 18; Jos. 3, 16 תָּמַם = *wholly*; Ps. 112, 9 פָּצַח = *plentifully*.

h Rem. This co-ordination without the copula belongs (as being more vigorous and bolder) rather to poetic or otherwise elevated style (comp. e.g. Is. 52, 1. Hos. 1, 6, with Gen. 25, 1, &c.). Asyndeton, however, is not wanting even in prose; besides the above examples (especially the imperatives of קום and לך Gen. 30, 31. Deut. 1, 5. 2, 24. Jos. 3, 16. 1 Sam. 3, 5) cf. also Neh. 3, 20.

¹ Comp. the analogous examples in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 102.

² To be distinguished, of course, from the cases in which two equally important and independent verbs are used together without the copula in vigorous poetic imagery, e.g. Ex. 15, 9. Job 29, 8, and elsewhere.

1 Chron. 13, 2. For special reasons the verb representing the principal idea may even come first; thus Is. 53, 11 יִרְאֶה יִשְׁכַּע *he shall see, he shall be satisfied* (sc. with the sight), for the satisfaction does not come until after the enjoyment of the sight; Jer. 4, 5 קָרָא מְלֵא *cry, fill*, i. e. cry with a full (loud) voice.

§ 121. Construction of Passive Verbs.

1. Verbs which in the active take *one* accusative (either of the *a* proper object, or of the *internal* object, or of nearer definition; comp. § 117. *a, p, u*) may in the passive, according to our mode of expression, be construed *personally*, the object of the active sentence now becoming the subject, e. g. Gen. 35, 19 וַתָּמָת רָחֵל וַתִּקָּבֶר *and Rachel died, and was buried*, &c. The passive, however, is very frequently used *impersonally* (in the 3rd sing. masc.), either absolutely, as Deut. 21, 3 sq. Ezek. 16, 34 (with a dative added, 2 Sam. 17, 16. Is. 53, 5. Lam. 5, 5), or with the object of the active construction still subordinated in the accusative¹, e. g. Gen. 27, 42 וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְרִבְקָה אֲמִידִּבְרֵי עֵשָׂו *and there were told (i. e. one told) to Rebekah the words of Esau*; 2 Sam. 21, 11. 1 Ki. 18, 13.

Other examples are: after Niph., Gen. 4, 18 וַיֵּלֶד לְחִנוֹךְ אֶת־עִירָד *and unto b Enoch was born Irad* (comp. Num. 26, 60, and after an infinitive, Gen. 21, 5); Gen. 17, 5. 21, 8 (after an infinitive); 29, 27. Ex. 21, 28. 25, 28. Lev. 6, 13. Num. 7, 10 (after an infinitive); 26, 55 (comp. verse 53); Num. 16, 29. Deut. 20, 8 (where, however, for יָצֵא the Hiph. יָצִיץ should be read, according to 1, 28); Jos. 7, 15; with the object preceding, Ex. 13, 7. Lev. 2, 8. 19, 20. Is. 16, 10. Dan. 9, 24².—Also after Pu'al, Jer. 50, 20; *before* Pu'al, Is. 14, 3 (אֶשְׂרָא equivalent to the internal object עֲלֵהָ = *which they have caused to be performed by thee*); Job 22, 9; according to the Masoretic text also Gen. 46, 22, where, however, the Samaritan and LXX read יֵלֶד for יָלַד; the Samaritan in Gen. 35, 26 and 46, 27 also reads יֵלֶד, and this (or יָלַד) should certainly be read instead of יָלַד in 2 Sam. 21, 22.—After Hoph., Ex. 10, 8. 27, 7. Lev. 10, 18. 16, 27. Num. 32, 5. 1 Ki. 2, 21. Job 30, 15; after the infinitive Hoph., Gen. 40, 20. Ezek. 16, 4 sq.; *before* Hoph., Is. 17, 1. 21, 2. Hos. 10, 6. Zech. 13, 6. Ps. 87, 3; after the infinitive Hothpa'el, Lev. 13, 55 sq.

¹ When this is not recognizable either by the *nota accusativi*, or by its disagreement with the passive form in gender, number, and person, it naturally cannot be determined whether the construction is really impersonal. The construction itself can only be explained by supposing that while using the passive form the speaker at the same time thinks of some author or authors of the action in question, just as on the theory of the Arab grammarians a *concealed agent* is included in every passive. This accounts for the possibility (comp. § 144. *g*) of using the active without a specified subject as a periphrasis for the passive.

² In 2 Ki. 18, 30 יִתֵּן is to be read or אֶת־ is to be omitted, as in the parallel passage Is. 36, 15.

- c 2. Verbs which in the active take two accusatives (according to § 117. cc) retain in the passive construction at least *one* accusative, namely that of the second or remoter object, whilst the nearer object now becomes the subject. Thus, corresponding to *אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶהָ* which I will show thee (Gen. 12, 1) the passive is *אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה מְרָאָה* (Ex. 25, 40) which thou hast been shown, i.e. which has been shown to thee; comp. Ex. 26, 30 (but in Lev. 13, 49 with an accusative of the person); Job 7, 3. In Ps. 22, 16 מְדַבֵּק מִלְּשׁוֹנִי depends on an assumed transitive הִדְבִּיק governing two accusatives (= *my tongue is made to cleave to my jaws*); also in Is. 1, 20, הָרֶבֶץ תֵּאָכְלוּ ye shall be devoured with the sword, הָרֶבֶץ is not an *accus. instrumenti*, but most probably an accusative of the object retained from the active construction¹.
- d Rem. 1. Examples of the retention of the second accusative are—(a) with *verba induendi* and *exuendi* (§ 117. cc), Ps. 80, 11 כָּפֹה הָיָה צֶלֶהָ the mountains were covered with the shadow of it (the vine); Prov. 19, 23. So also some of the examples in § 116. k of passive participles of these verbs, Jud. 18, 11. 1 Sam. 2, 18. 17, 5. 1 Ki. 22, 10. Ezek. 9, 2. 3²; with the accusative preceding, Neh. 4, 12.—(b) with *verba copiae* and *inopiae*, Ex. 1, 7. Is. 38, 10 (equivalent to *I must forego the residue of my years*); Is. 40, 20.—(c) an accusative of the result (§ 117. ii) with the passive, Is. 6, 11. Zech. 14, 4. Job 28, 2; with the accusative preceding, Is. 24, 12. Mic. 3, 12 (Jer. 26, 18). Job 15, 7. 22, 16³. Also in Ezek. 40, 17 and 46, 23, the accusative preceding (in 41, 18 following) עָשָׂי can only be taken as the accusative of the result; some general idea, such as that of *place*, is to be understood as the subject of עָשָׂי.—(d) an accusative of the member or part specially affected by the action (§ 117. ll), Gen. 17, 11. 14. 24. Jud. 1, 7 (accusative *before* part. pass.); 2 Sam. 15, 32 (accusative with suffix *after* the part. pass.).
- e 2. Both accusatives are retained in an unusual manner after the passive of a *verbum implendi* in Num. 14, 21; instead, however, of the *Niph.* הִיפְתָּם the

¹ In the active, the sentence would be *I will cause the sword to devour you*; by the rule stated above, letter c, this would become in the passive, *the sword* (nom.) *shall be made to devour you* (acc.). Instead of this, the remoter object is here made the subject, and the nearer object is retained in the accusative. Otherwise, the only possible explanation would be, according to the Arabic idiom, *to cause one to devour the sword* (remoter object), i.e. to give him over to it.

² Analogous to הִלְבִּישׁ הַכֹּהֵן *who was clothed in linen*, Ezek. 9, 3, would be הָיָה וְהוֹתֵר אֶת־הַמֶּזֶן Chron. 31, 10; but we must certainly read there הוֹתֵר with the LXX.—Still less can Ps. 87, 3 be so explained, נִכְבְּרוֹת being not an accusative, but the subject of a noun-clause. On the other hand, שָׁלַחְתָּ 1 Ki. 14, 6 may be explained with Ewald in the sense of *being charged with something*, so that, like צִוָּה, it may be construed with an accusative.

³ In reality הָיָה Ex. 16, 20. 26 (*it became putrid*) is equivalent to a passive (*it was changed*), to which הוֹלָאֵם is added as an accusative of the result.

Qal (which is sometimes used transitively elsewhere) should simply be read with the LXX; similarly in Ps. 72, 19, although there the LXX also translate the passive.

3. The efficient cause (or personal agent) is, as a rule, attached *f* to the passive by ל (thus corresponding to the Greek and Latin dative), e. g. Gen. 25, 21 יְהוָה לִי יִתְעַרַּר *Yahweh let himself be intreated by him*; comp. 14, 19. Lev. 26, 23. 2 Sam. 2, 5 (Ps. 115, 15). Ps. 73, 10; *before* the verb, Prov. 14, 20 and frequently. Less commonly by מִן (called מִן of origin = *coming from*), e. g. Gen. 9, 11. Job 28, 4; *before* the verb, Ps. 37, 23. Job 24, 1; by ב (instrumenti), Gen. 9, 6 (בְּאָדָם *by man*); Num. 36, 2. Is. 14, 3. Hos. 14, 4, always to introduce a personal agent.—On the connexion of the passive participle with a genitive of the agent, cf. § 116. l.

II. Syntax of the Noun.

§ 122. *Indication of the Gender of the Noun.*

Cf. F. Schwabe, *Die Genusbestimmung des Nomens im bibl. Hebr.*, Jena, 1894, and especially the thorough investigation by K. Albrecht, 'Das Geschlecht der hebr. Hauptwörter,' in *ZAW.* 1895, p. 313 sqq., and 1896, p. 61 sqq.

1. According to § 80. a, Hebrew, like the other Semitic languages, *a* distinguishes only a *masculine* and *feminine* gender. To indicate the latter a special feminine ending is generally used (§ 80. b and § 87. i) both in the singular and plural (see, however, § 87. p), its use being most consistent in adjectives and participles; comp. § 87. r. The employment of these special endings is most natural, when by means of them the feminine names of persons or animals are distinguished from the masculine of the same stem and the same formation, e. g. אָח brother, אחות sister; עָלָם a young man, עֲלָמָה a young woman, maid; פָּר iuvencus, פָּרָה iuvenca; עֵזֶל vitulus, עֵזְלָה vitula. On the other hand, the feminine plays an important part in denoting the gender of whole classes of ideas (see below, letter p, &c.), which the Hebrew regards as feminine. The language, however, is not restricted to the use of the feminine ending either for the purpose of distinguishing the *sex* of animate objects (see letter b), or as an indication of the (*figurative*) gender of inanimate things which are regarded as feminine (see letter h).

2. The distinction of *sex* may be effected even without the feminine *b* ending, (a) by the employment of words of different stems for the

masculine and feminine; (b) by the different construction (either as masculine or feminine) of the same word (*communia*). But the distinction may also, (c) in the case of names of animals, be entirely neglected, all examples of a species being included under one particular gender, either masculine or feminine (*epicoena*).

c Examples of (a) are: אב father, אם mother; איל ram, עז he-goat, עז she-goat; חמור he-ass, אתון she-ass; אריה lion, לביא lioness. Sometimes with the additional feminine ending, e.g. עבד male slave, man-servant, אמה or שפחה female slave, maid; חתן bridegroom, כלה bride.

d Of (b): נמל camel. Plur. נמלים construed as masculine, Gen. 24, 63; as feminine, Gen. 32, 16; בקר collect. oxen, Ex. 21, 37, construed as masculine, but Gen. 33, 13. Job 1, 14 as feminine. In Jer. 2, 24 the construction of פרה wild ass, changes directly from the masculine (intended as epicene) to the feminine. Comp. in Greek δ, ἡ παῖς δ, ἡ βοῦς.

e Of (c): analogous to the epicene nouns of other languages, many species of animals which are strong and courageous, are regarded in Hebrew as always masculine, while the weak and timid are feminine; comp. δ λύκος, ἡ χελιδὼν, and the German *der Löwe, der Tiger, der Panther, der Wolf, der Adler*, &c., but *die Katze, die Taube, die Biene*, &c. Similarly in Hebrew, e.g. אילן ox (Ps. 144, 14 even referring to cows in calf), דוב bear, Hos. 13, 8 נשאל (a bear that is bereaved of her whelps; comp., however, a Ki. 2, 24. Is. 11, 7), זאב wolf, כלב dog, all masculine; but ארנבת hare, יונה dove, חסידה stork, דבורה bee, נמרה ant, &c., feminine.

f Rem. 1. Masculine nouns which either have a separate feminine form or might easily form one, are but seldom used as epicene; such are, חמור ass, 2 Sam. 19, 27 for אתון; איל hart, Ps. 42, 2 for איילה. In Gen. 23, 4 sqq. מת a dead body, refers more especially to the body of a woman; אלהים god, is used of a goddess, 1 Ki. 11, 5, elsewhere always masculine; אמן a master workman, in Prov. 8, 30 refers to wisdom (חכמה feminine, comp. Plin. 2, 1 *natura omnium artifex*; and our use of *friend, teacher, servant, neighbour*, either as masculine or feminine; in German, *Gemahl*¹ stands also for *Gemahlin*, &c.).

g 2. Of words denoting persons נער נַעַר waṭṭ, according to the commonly received opinion, was in early times used as epicene (see, however, above, § 2. n). The use of the plural נערים in Job 1, 19 and Ruth 2, 21 in the sense of *young people* (of both genders) does not, however, prove this. In this and in similar cases

¹ So in early Arabic, *ba'l* (lord) and *sauf* (conjux) are used both for *maritus* and *uxor*; 'arūs for *bridegroom* and *bride*; the later language, however, distinguishes the feminine from the masculine in all these cases generally by the ending *a* (af). In early Arabic also the feminine ending is commonly omitted in such participles as *ḥānil, bāṭin* (gravida), and the like, which from the meaning of the word can only be used of females. Thus also אמן, at least in Num. 11, 12 (Is. 49, 23!), probably means *nurse* (for אִמָּה 2 Sam. 4, 4, &c.), not *nursing-father*.

(comp. e.g. אֲרָם Gen. 1, 27 and אֲרָמִים 32, 1) the masculine as *prior gender* includes the feminine¹.

3. The following classes of ideas are usually regarded as *feminine*², although the substantives which express them are mostly without the feminine ending³:

(a) Names of *countries* and *towns*, since they are regarded as the mothers⁴ and nurses of the inhabitants; e.g. אֲשּׁוּר *Assyria*, אֲדָמָה *Idumaea*, צֵידוֹן *Tyre*; comp. also such expressions as בֵּית בָּבֶל *daughter of Babylon*, בֵּית צִיּוֹן *daughter of Zion*, &c.

Rem. The same proper nouns, which as names of countries are regarded as *feminine*, are frequently used also as names of the people, and may then, like national names in other languages, be construed as masculine; thus יְהוּדָה masc. Is. 3, 8, and elsewhere, *Judaei*; but Is. 7, 6, fem., *Judaea*; אֲרָם masc., *Idumaei*, Num. 20, 20; fem., *Idumaea*, Jer. 49, 17. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens that by a very common transference of thought (like our expression *Turkey concludes peace*) these names are construed as feminine, even when they denote not the country but the inhabitants; so יְהוּדָה Lam. 1, 3; comp. Gen. 41, 8. Ex. 10, 7, 12, 33. 1 Sam. 17, 21. 2 Sam. 8, 2, 24, 9. Is. 7, 2, 21, 2, 42, 11. Jer. 50, 10. Job 1, 15. Hence the frequent personification of nations (as well as of countries and towns, see below, note 4) as female beings, e.g. Is. 50, 1, 54, 1 sqq., and the transference of the expressions בֵּית בָּבֶל Is. 47, 1 sqq., בֵּית צִיּוֹן &c. (see above) from the town to the inhabitants.

(b) Appellative nouns, which denote a *circumscribed space*, such as אֶרֶץ *earth, land*, עוֹלָם *world*, שְׂאֵל *the abode of the dead*, עֵינַן *circle* (of the Jordan valley), עִיר *a town*, בְּאֵר *a well*, צֶמֶח *the north*, דִּשָּׁן *the south*.

¹ The Arab grammarians call this use of the masculine plural and dual (e.g. 'el-'abawāni, the two fathers, i.e. *parentes*) *taghlīb* or *the making* (the masculine) prevail (over the feminine).—Comp. M. Grünert, *Die Begriffs-Präponderanz und die Duale a potiori im Altarab.*, Vienna, 1886.

² The masculine gender is attributed 'by the Hebrews and the Semites generally to whatever is dangerous, savage, courageous, respected, great, strong, powerful...; the feminine to whatever is motherly, productive, sustaining, nourishing, gentle, weak, . . . subject, &c.' (Albrecht, *ZAW.* 1896, p. 120 sq.).

³ When, on the other hand, words with a feminine-ending, such as נְחֹשֶׁת *brass*, קֶשֶׁת *a bow* (stem קָשַׁת), זֶמַן *time* (see the *Lexicon*), are sometimes construed as masculine, this is owing probably in some cases to a misunderstanding of the formation of the word, the ה of the feminine being regarded as a radical.

⁴ Comp. a city and a mother (מִתְּנָה) in Israel, 2 Sam. 20, 19. In the same way, מִתְּנָה (like μητήρ, *mater*) on Phoenician coins stands for *mother-city*, μητρόπολις. The same figure is used in such expressions as *sons of Zion*, Ps. 149, 2; *sons of Babylon*, Ezek. 23, 15, &c., as also in speaking of the suburbs of a city as its *daughters*, e.g. Jos. 15, 45 sqq., and elsewhere.—The comparison of Jerusalem to a woman is especially frequent in allegorical descriptions, e.g. Ezek. 16. Lam. 1, 1, and elsewhere.

- l In the majority of nouns denoting place the gender is variable, e.g. אֶרֶץ *a way* (usually feminine; the masculine gender only begins to predominate with Ezekiel; cf. Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 55), נָיָא (נִי) *valley*, גֶּן *garden* (fem. Gen. 2, 15, unless לְעִבְרָה, &c., is to be read), הַיְכָל *palace, temple*, חֲצֵר *court*, בֵּדֶם *vineyard*, שַׁעַר *door*¹, &c.; also מָקוֹם *place*, at least in Gen. 18, 24 (referring to Sodom), Job 20, 9, and 2 Sam. 17, 12 *K^ethibh*, is construed as feminine. The mountains and hills commanding the surrounding country are almost without exception masculine (see Albrecht, l. c., p. 60 sq.).
- m (c) The names of *instruments, utensils*, and (on the same analogy) *members and parts of the body* in man or beast, since these are all regarded as subservient and subordinate (consequently as feminine).
- n Thus חֶרֶב *sword*, יָתֵד *tent-peg*, בַּר *bucket*, כַּף *cup*, נֶעֱל *shoe*, עֶרֶשׁ *bed*, &c.; in other cases, as אָרוֹן *chest, ark*, תֹּנִי *oven*, the gender is variable. ('Instruments for binding or holding, girdles and the like, as constraining and mastering, are masculine,' Albrecht, l. c. p. 89.)—Also אֶזְרָא *ear*, אֶצְבָּע *finger* (and so probably בֶּהָן *thumb, great toe*, יָד and כַּף *hand*, יְמִין *right hand*, רֶגֶל *foot*, בִּרְךָ *knee*, יֵד *thigh*, כַּתֵּף *shoulder*, לֶחִי *cheek*, בֶּטֶן *belly*; כַּנֶּף *wing*, קֶרֶן *horn*, עֵצָם *bone*, שֵׁן *tooth*; as a rule also זְרוּעַ *arm* (masc. Is. 17, 5 and elsewhere), לְשׁוֹן *tongue* (masc. Ps. 22, 16 and elsewhere), עֵין *eye* (masc. Zech. 3, 9 and elsewhere), שׁוֹן *thigh* (masc. Ex. 29, 27)².
- o (d) Certain names of natural forces or substances are feminine, being probably regarded as instruments, while in the names of the heavens, the heavenly bodies and natural phenomena, the masculine generally predominates (cf. Albrecht, l. c., p. 323 sqq.); thus feminine are שֶׁשׁ *sun* (but often also masc., Ps. 19, 6. 104, 19); אֵשׁ (Eth. *ʾēš*) *fire* (rarely masc.); נֹהַר *brightness*, אֶבֶן *a stone*, as a rule also רֵיחַ *wind, spirit*; נְפֶשׁ *breath, soul*; also אֹר *light* in Jer. 13, 16. Job 36, 32, and others.
- p 4. The following classes of ideas, which are also regarded as feminine in Hebrew (see above, letter h), are usually indicated by the feminine form, notwithstanding their occasional transference to masculine persons (see letters r and s):
- q (a) Abstracts³ (sometimes along with masculine forms from the same stem, as נִקְמָה *vengeance*, as well as נִקָּם, עֲזָרָה *help*, as well as עָזַר, e.g. אֲמִצְנָה *firmness*,

¹ מַחֲנֶה *camp* is feminine only when it is a collective, denoting the persons in a camp.

² אִף *nose*, זָנָב *tail*, מִצָּח *forehead*, עֶקֶב *heel*, עֲרֵךְ *back of the neck*, פֶּה *mouth*, צֵוֶה *neck*, also רֶחֶם *womb*, except in Jer. 30, 17, are invariably construed as masculine.

³ Cf. the list of masculine and feminine abstracts in Albrecht, l. c., 1896, p. 111 sqq.

faithfulness, גְּבוּרָה *strength*, גְּדֻלָּה *greatness*, מְלֵאכָה *fullness*, מְשָׁלָה *dominion*, &c. Similarly, the feminine (sing. and plur.) of adjectives and participles is used substantivally in the sense of the Latin and Greek *neuter*, e. g. נְכוּנָה *stedfastness*, Ps. 5, 10, טוֹבָה *goodness*, רָעָה *evil*, Gen. 50, 20, נֶסֶלָה *a light thing* (i.e. a trifling thing), Jer. 6, 14; so especially in the plural, e. g. גְּדֻלּוֹת *great things*, Ps. 12, 4; הַנְּהָרְסוֹת *the ruined places*, Ezek. 36, 36, along with הַנִּשְׁמָה *that which was desolate*, טוֹבוֹת *kindnesses*, 2 Ki. 25, 28, נְכוּנָה *uprightness, honesty*, Is. 26, 10, נְעִימוֹת *amoenae*, Ps. 16, 11 (but in verse 6 in the same sense נְעִימִים), נִפְלְאוֹת *wonderful things*, Ex. 34, 10 and frequently, קָשׁוֹת *hard things, roughly*, Gen. 42, 7, 30 (but cf. also רֵיקִים *vain things*, Prov. 12, 11, 28, 19). Comp. moreover, the very frequent use of הָיָא, הָיָה (as well as הָיָה וְהָיָה), Jud. 14, 4, Ps. 118, 23 and elsewhere, in the sense of *hoc, illud* (also הִנֵּה equivalent to *illa*, Is. 51, 19); also the use of the feminine form of the verb in Is. 7, 7 תָּקִים לֹא תִהְיֶה *it shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass*; Jud. 14, 41, Jer. 10, 7; so too the suffixes Gen. 15, 6, Ex. 10, 11, Job 38, 18, referring back to a whole statement¹.

(δ) Titles and designations of office, properly a subdivision of the abstract ideas treated above, under letter *q*, and specially noticed here only on account of their peculiar transference to concrete male persons. Thus we have קְהָלֶת Eccles. 1, 1, &c. (as a title of Solomon), properly no doubt that *which takes part in or speaks in a religious assembly*, hence LXX ἐκκλησιαστικῆς, i.e. *concionary, preacher*; the proper names סֹפֶרֶת Ezra 2, 55, Neh. 7, 57, and פֹּכֶרֶת Ezra 2, 57, Neh. 7, 59, and the foreign word פִּחָה *viceroys*²; in the plural פְּנִינֹת prop. *cognomina*, then *like named, colleagues*; פְּרָעוֹת *princes* (if this be the true meaning)³. All these words, in accordance with their meaning, are construed as masculine (in Eccles. 7, 27 instead of אִמְרָה *the words* should rather be divided as אִמְרֵי הַקֵּץ; comp. 12, 8).

¹ While in all these instances it is simplest to speak of the *feminine* in Hebrew as being used *for the neuter* (which in Latin, Greek, and German is commonly employed for similar purposes), it must yet not be forgotten that since the language is wholly wanting in *neuters*, the Semitic mind regarded the above-mentioned forms primarily as actual feminines. Hence the Arab commentators are accustomed to explain the feminines of adjectives and participles (which would be neuter in Latin, &c.) by the addition of a feminine substantive.

² An Assyrian word, found at least as early as the time of Sargon, who appointed *paḥḍri* over South Babylonia. The view that it is of Persian origin is a mistake: see Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, on 1 Ki. 10, 15.—G.W.C.]

³ This use of the feminine form is far more frequent in Arabic, Ethiopic and Aramaic; comp. e.g. in Arabic *ḥalīfa* (fem. from *ḥalīf*, following after, taking the place of) in the sense of the successor or representative (of Muḥammad), and *‘allāma* (*great wisdom*) as a title of learned men. Analogous to this is the Latin *magistratus, magistracy*, for *magistrate*, and our *his Majesty, Excellency, Highness, &c.*

5 Abstract ideas include also—

(c) *Collectives* in the fem. form¹, generally fem. participles used substantively, especially as the comprehensive designation of a number of *persons*, e.g. *אֲנִיָּה* (fem. of travelling), prop. *the travelling* (company), i.e. travelling persons (a caravan); *גִּלְגָּל* (fem. of *גָּלָה* *one going into exile*) *the company of exiles* (also frequently used of those who had returned home again); *אֲשֵׁכָה* (that which inhabits) i.e. *the population*, Is. 12, 6. Mic. 1, 11 sq.; *אֲיֵכָה* (prop. that which is hostile) *the enemy*, Mic. 7, 8. 10 (comp. Mic. 4, 6 sq. *the halting, cast off, driven away* i.e. *those who halt, &c.*); *דָּלָה* (the abject) *the poorest sort*; of living beings which are not persons, comp. *חַיָּה* (that which lives) in the sense of *cattle, beasts*; *דָּגָה* *a shoal of fish*, Gen. 1, 26 (but in Jon. 2, 2 as a *nomen unitatis*, comp. letter *t*, for *דָּג* *a fish*, which in verses 1 and 11 is used as a *nomen unitatis*). Comp., moreover, *גִּבְלָה* *dead body*, Is. 26, 19, and elsewhere (construed as masculine), for *a heap of dead bodies*.—On the poetic personifications, comprising the mass of a nation, by means of *בַּת* *daughter*, in *בְּרַל*, *בַּת עַמִּי*, *בַּת עַמִּי* (equivalent to *עַמִּי*) *my countrymen*, see above, letter *i*.

t (d) Conversely the feminine form of substantives is sometimes used (as in Arabic) as a *nomen unitatis*, i.e. to indicate a *single* example of a class which is denoted by the masculine form; comp. *אֲנִיָּה* *a fleet* (1 Ki. 9, 26), *אֲנִיָּה* *a single ship* (Jon. 1, 3 sqq.); *שֵׁעַר* *hair* (coll.), *שֵׁעֶרָה* *a single hair* (Jud. 20, 16; in the plural, 1 Sam. 14, 45. Ps. 40, 13); *שִׁיר* *a poem*, frequently collective, *שִׁירָה* *a single song*; so probably also *תְּאֵנָה* *a fig* (the corresponding masculine *תֵּן* is collective in Arabic); *שִׁשְׁמֹנֶה* *a lily* (also *שִׁשְׁמֹן*); *לִבְנָה* *a brick* (Arab. *libina*, but *libin* collective), &c.

u (e) The feminine is also used for things *without life* (as being weaker or less important), which are named from their resemblance to *organic* things expressed by the corresponding masculine form; comp. *זֶרֶךְ* *side* (of the body), *זֶרֶכָה*, *זֶרֶכָה* *back part, border* (of a country, house, &c.); *מִצְחָה* *forehead*, *מִצְחָה* *greaves*. On a similar distinction between the masculine for natural, and the feminine for artificial objects, see § 87. o.

v Rem. The juxtaposition of the masculine and feminine from the same stem serves sometimes to express entirety; e.g. Is. 3, 1 *וּמִשְׁעָנָה וּמִשְׁעָנָה* *stay and staff*, i.e. every kind of support. For similar groupings in the case of persons, see Is. 43, 6. 49, 22. 60, 4 (*sons and daughters*); 49, 23. Eccles. 2, 8.

§ 123. *The Representation of Plural Ideas by Means of Collectives, and by the Repetition of Words.*

a Besides the plural endings treated in § 87. a-i, the language employs other means to express a plurality of living beings or things:

(a) Certain words employed exclusively in a collective sense, while the individual members of the class are denoted by special words (*nomina unitatis*, but not in the same sense as in § 122. f).

¹ Comp. in Greek ἡ ἱππος, *the cavalry* (as well as τὸ ἱππικόν), ἡ κάμηλος, Hdt. 1, 80 and elsewhere, *the camel corps*.

Thus חֲמִשָּׁה בָּקָר *cattle, oxen*¹ (even joined with numerals, e.g. Ex. 21, 37 חֲמִשָּׁה בָּקָר *five head of cattle*), but שׂוֹר *an ox*; צֹאן *small cattle*, i.e. sheep and goats (μῆλα), comp. Job 1, 3 שֶׁבַע עָלֶיֶם צֹאן *seven thousand sheep*; but שֶׁהָ *a single head of small cattle* (a sheep or a goat). Other more or less common collectives are: יָד (prop. that which prowls or roams) *wild beasts*, נָפֶץ (perhaps prop. *tripping*) *a number of little children*; רֶשֶׁת *fresh green herb*, i.e. young plants, יֶרֶק *green*, i.e. vegetation in general; עוֹף *birds, fowl*; רֶכֶב *chariots or cavalcade*, רֶפְּחָה *worms*, רֶמֶשׁ *creeping things* (of small creatures), שְׂרָץ *swarming things*.

(b) The collective use of substantives which at the same time serve *b* as *nomina unitalis*; thus, אָדָם (never in plur.) means both *man* (homo) and *men* (homines); אִישׁ *a man* (vir) and *men* (viri); אִשָּׁה *woman* and *women* (Jud. 21, 16. 1 Sam. 21, 6); אַרְבֶּה *a locust*, but usually *a swarm of locusts*; נַפְשׁ *soul* and *souls* (persons); מַסָּל *staff* and *staves* (Gen. 30, 37); עֵיט *a bird of prey* and *birds of prey*; עִיר *city* and *cities* (Jud. 19, 12. Jer. 4, 29); עֵלֶף *a leaf* and *foliage*; עֵשֶׂב *a plant* and *plants, herbs*; עֵץ *a tree* and *trees* (as it were *foliage*); פֵּרוֹ *fruit* and *fruits*; שֵׁן *a shrub* and *shrubs*; in isolated instances also nouns like עֶבֶד *man-servant*, שִׁפְחָה *maid-servant*, חֲמֹר *ass*, שׂוֹר *ox* (comp. Gen. 32, 6).—On the singular (especially of gentile names) with the article to include all individuals of the same species, comp. § 126. l. On the special meaning of the plurals formed from certain collectives, see § 124. l.

(c) The feminine ending; see § 122. s.

(d) The repetition of single words, and even of whole groups *c* of words, especially to express entirety, or in a distributive sense. The following cases are more particularly to be noticed:

1. The repetition of one or more words to express the idea of *every, all*, as יוֹם יוֹם Gen. 39, 10, &c., *day by day, every day*; שָׁנָה שָׁנָה *year by year*, Deut. 14, 22; אִישׁ אִישׁ *every man*, Ex. 36, 4; with בֵּ before the second word (but only in late passages), e.g. יוֹם בְּיוֹם *day by day*, 1 Chron. 12, 22; שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה *year by year*, Deut. 15, 20. 1 Sam. 1, 7 (but in verse 3 יָמִים יָמִים *days*), Num. 24, 1. Jud. 16, 20. 20, 30sq. 1 Sam. 3, 10 *as at other times*; or before both words, as בֹּקֶר בֹּקֶר Ex. 16, 21, *every morning* (so before a group of words, Lev. 24, 8); in the same sense also with the distributive לְ, לְבֹקֶר לְבֹקֶר 1 Chron. 9, 27; with a single plural, לְבָקָרִים Ps. 73, 14, or לְבָקָרִים Job 7, 18 along with לְרִנָּתָם *every moment*. Also with the two words united by means of wāw copulative, וְאִישׁ וְאִישׁ Ps. 87, 5, or וְאִישׁ וְאִישׁ Est. 1, 8; וְדוֹר וְדוֹר *all generations*, Deut. 32, 7;

¹ The plural form בָּקָרִים from בָּקָר is found only in very late Hebrew, Neh. 10, 37 (where according to the Mantua edition, Ginsburg, &c., צֹאנֵנוּ *our sheep*, is also to be read; Baer, however, has צֹאנֵנוּ), and 2 Chron. 4, 3. In Amos 6, 12 read, with Hitzig, יָם בֹּקֶר יָם.

יום יום Est. 3, 4; comp. Est. 8, 9. Ezra 10, 14. 1 Chron. 26, 13 (cf. Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 439, and Driver, *Introd.* p. 505, No. 35); sometimes (but with the exception of Ps. 45, 18 only in very late passages) with a pleonastic *לִפְנֵי* preceding, Ps. 145, 13. Est. 2, 11. 9, 28. 2 Chron. 11, 12 and elsewhere.

- d 2. Repetition of words in an expressly *distributive* sense¹ (which may to some extent be noticed in the examples under letter c) equivalent to *one each*, &c., e.g. Num. 14, 34 *forty days* יוֹם לְשָׁנָה יוֹם לְשָׁנָה *counting for every day a year*; comp. Ezek. 24, 6. Ex. 28, 34 (three words repeated); also with the addition of *לְבַד* *apart*, עָרַר עָרַר לְבַד *every drove by itself*, Gen. 32, 17; comp. Zech. 12, 12. Most frequently with the addition of a numeral (comp. for the simple repetition of numerals for the same purpose, § 134. g), and with the words not only in groups of two (Lev. 24, 8. Num. 13, 2. 31, 4) or three (Num. 7, 11. 17, 21), but even of six (Ex. 26, 3) or seven (Ex. 25, 33. 26, 19. 21, 25); in Ex. 25, 35 five words even three times repeated².

- e 3. Repetition to express an exceptional or at least superfine quality; e.g. 2 Ki. 25, 15 *which were of gold, gold, of silver, silver*, i.e. made of pure gold and pure silver; Deut. 2, 27 בְּרֶדֶךְ בְּרֶדֶךְ *only along by the high way*; comp. Num. 3, 9. 8, 16 *they are given, given to him*, i.e. given exclusively for his service, for his very own. Also with a certain hyperbole in such examples as 2 Ki. 3, 16 גִּבִּים גִּבִּים *nothing but trenches*; Gen. 14, 10 בְּאֵרֵת חֶמְסָר *all asphalt-pits*.—Repetition serves to intensify the expression to the highest degree in Jud. 5, 22 *by reason of the violent pransings of his strong ones*, Ex. 8, 10 (*countless heaps*), and Joel 4, 14 (*countless multitudes*); cf. also מְעַט מְעַט Ex. 23, 30 *by little and little, very gradually*; cf. § 133. k.

- f 4. Repetition with the copula to express *of more than one kind*; thus Deut. 25, 13 (Prov. 20, 10) זָאֵן וְזָאֵן *a weight and a weight*, i.e. two kinds of weight (hence the addition *great and small*); Ps. 12, 3 לֵב וְלֵב *with two kinds of heart*, i.e. *with a double-dealing heart*; cf. לֵב לֵב 1 Chron. 12, 33.

§ 124. The Various Uses of the Plural-form³.

- a 1. The plural is by no means used in Hebrew solely to express a number of individuals or separate objects, but may also denote them collectively. This use of the plural expresses either (a) a combination of various external constituent parts (plurals of *local extension*),

¹ Comp. in the New Testament St. Mark vi. 39 sq. *συντάβια συντάβια, πρᾶσαι πρᾶσαι* (Weizsäcker, *tischweise, beetweise*).

² These repetitions of larger groups of words belong entirely to the *Priestly Code* in the Pentateuch, and are unquestionably indications of a late period of the language. Of quite a different kind are such examples as Ezek. 16, 6, where the repetition of four words serves to give greater solemnity to the promise, unless here, as certainly in 1, 20, it is a mere *dittography*; the LXX omit the repetition in both passages.

³ Comp. Dietrich, 'Über Begriff und Form des hebr. Plurals,' in the *Abhandl. sur hebr. Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 2 sqq.

or (δ) a more or less intensive focussing of the characteristics inherent in the idea of the stem (*abstract plurals*, usually rendered in English by forms in *-hood, -ness, -ship*). A variety of the plurals described under (δ), in which the secondary idea of *intensity* or of an *internal multiplication* of the idea of the stem may be clearly seen, is (c) the *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis*.

Examples of (a): Plurals of *local extension* to denote localities in general, but especially level surfaces (the *surface-plural*), since in them the idea of a whole composed of innumerable separate parts or points is most evident, as שָׁמַיִם (§ 88. d) *heaven* (comp. also מְרוֹמִים *heights* of heaven, Is. 33, 16. Job 16, 19; elsewhere מְרוֹם); מַיִם *water*; יָמִים (the broad surface of the sea) poetically for יָם *sea*; פָּנִים (prop. the side *turned towards* any one, then) *surface* in general, usually *face*; אַחֲרֵימֵי the back, Ex. 26, 12. 33, 23, &c., צוֹנְאֵרִים *neck, nape of the neck*¹; also מְרִאשׁוֹת the place at the head, מְרִגְלוֹת place at the feet; עֲבָרִים place on the other side (of a river); מְעַמְקִים *depth*, מְרִחֲקִים (also מְרַחֵק) *distance*, מְשַׁכְּבִים *bed*, Gen. 49, 4 (unless, with Dillmann, it is to be explained in the sense of *double bed*, i.e. *torus*), מְשַׁכְּנִים Ps. 46, 5, and מְשַׁכְּנוֹת 132, 5, *dwelling* (perhaps also אֶהְיֶה *encampment*, in passages like 1 Sam. 4, 10). The last four belong, however, to poetic style, and are better reckoned amongst the *plurals of amplification* treated under letters d-f. So perhaps יַצְעִים *bed* (Ps. 63, 7. Job 17, 13; but Gen. 49, 4. Ps. 132, 3, and elsewhere, in the singular); probably, however, יַצְעִים (prop. *strata*) refers to a number of coverings or pillows.

The plural of extension is used to denote a lengthened period of *time* in עוֹלָמִים *eternity* (everlasting ages).

Rem. The plural of extension includes also a few examples which were formerly c explained as simply poetic plurals, e.g. Job 17, 1 לִי קְבָרִים *graves are* (ready) for me, i.e. the place where there are many of them (as it were *the graveyard*) is my portion, Job 21, 32. 2 Chron. 16, 14; cf. 2 Ki. 22, 20.

Of (b): the tolerably numerous abstract plurals, mostly of a particular form d (qittālīm, qittālīm, &c.) may be divided into two classes. They sum up either the *conditions* or *qualities* inherent in the idea of the stem, or else the various single *acts* of which an action is composed. Comp. for the first class, בְּחוּרִים and בְּחוּרוֹת *youth*, זְקֵנִים and זְקֵנוֹת *old age*, נְעוּרִים *youth*; בְּתוּלִים and בְּתוּלוֹת *maidenhood*, פְּגִילוֹת *bridal state*; מְנוּרִים *condition of a sojourner*, בְּשָׁרִים *fleshliness* (only in Prov. 14, 30; cf. Delitzsch); חַיִּים *life* (the abstract idea of the qualities of a living being); יְסוּדִים *childlessness*, סְנוּרִים *blindness*, עֲוֵעִים *perverseness*.

¹ Comp. the same use of the plural in τὰ στέρνα, τὰ νῶτα, τὰ πλάχηλα, *praecordia, cervices, fauces*; on plurals of extension in general, comp. the prepositions of place and time in the plur. form, § 103. n. סְפָרִים is not a case in point, in the sense of *letter* (properly a sheet folded into several pages; elsewhere also סִפְרָה 1 Ki. 21, 8 sqq. 2 Ki. 10, 1. 19, 14 (Is. 37, 14; referred to afterwards by the singular suffix); Is. 39, 1. Jer. 29, 25. 32, 14 (after being folded, previously סִפְרָה).

e There are also a number of plurals, found almost exclusively in poetry (sometimes along with the singular), which are evidently intended to intensify the idea of the stem, as *אֱמוּנִים* might, Is. 40, 26; *אֱמוּנָה* (as well as *אֱמוּנָה*) *faithfulness*; *אֲשֵׁרִי* (according to § 93. 1, only in the construct state plural or with suffixes = *the happiness of*), *happy*; *בִּינֹת* Is. 27, 11 and *בִּינֹתָ* Is. 40, 14, &c. (keen) *understanding*; *דַּעִים* Job 37, 16 and *דַּעֹת* 1 Sam. 2, 3 (thorough) *knowledge*; *בְּרָחוֹת* Job 12, 6 and *מִבְּרָחוֹת* Is. 32, 18 (full) *confidence*; *בְּרָכוֹת* (abundant) *blessing*, Ps. 21, 7; *הָוָה* Ps. 5, 10 (very) *destruction*; *חֲמוּדָה* Dan. 9, 23 (greatly) *beloved*; *חֲמוֹת* Ps. 76, 11, &c. (fierce) *wrath*; *חֲרָפוֹת* Dan. 12, 2 (utter) *contempt*; *מֵרָאָה* Gen. 46, 2 (an important) *vision*; *מִישְׁרִים* *uprightness*; *תַּהֲפֻזִּית* *perversity*; *חֲשֵׁכִים* and *חֲשֵׁכִים* (thick) *darkness*; *מִסְתָּרִים* a (close) *hiding-place*; *נִיבִירִים* *nobility*; *שֶׁמֶן* Is. 28, 1 *fatness*; *צִחְצֻחוֹת* (complete) *aridity*; *מִתְקָדִים* *sweetness*; *מִתְקָדִים* *preciousness*; *שִׁשְׁשִׁים* *delight*; *עֲנִיִּים* and *תַּעֲנִיִּים* *pleasure*; *רַחֲמִים* *compassion*; *מִנְחָה* Ps. 23, 2 *rest, refreshment*; *מְהוּמָה* Am. 3, 9 *tumult*. On the other hand, *חֵכְמוֹת* *wisdom* (Prov. 1, 20 and elsewhere) can hardly be a plural (= the essence of wisdom, or wisdom personified), but is a singular (see § 86. 7).

f The summing up of the several parts of an action is expressed in *חֲנֻמִּים* the *embalming*, *כְּפָרִים* *atonement*, *מִלְּאִים* (prop. *filling*, sc. of the hand) *ordination to the priesthood*, *שְׁלָחִים* *dismissal*, *שְׁלָחִים* *retribution*, *פְּתָחִים* *engraving* (of a seal, &c.); *אֲהָבִים* *fornication*, *וְהִנֵּי* *whoredom*, *נֶאֱפִים* *adultery*; *נֶחֱמִים* (prop. no doubt, warm compassion) *consolation*, *תַּחֲנֻנִּים* *supplication*, *נִדְדִים* Job 7, 4 (restless) *tossing to and fro*, *עֲלִילָה* *gleaning*; perhaps also *נִינֹת* Ps. 4, 1. 6, 1, and elsewhere, if it means *the playing on stringed instruments*, and *שְׁלֹמִים* Is. 1, 23 *bribery*, unless it be a plural of number¹.

g Of (c): the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis*, as has been remarked above, is properly a variety of the abstract plural, since it sums up the several characteristics² belonging to the idea, besides possessing (like some of the substantives under letter *e*) the secondary sense of an *intensification* of the original idea; so especially *אֱלֹהִים* *Godhead, God* (to be distinguished from the numerical plural *gods*, Ex. 12, 12, and elsewhere). The supposition that *אֱלֹהִים* is to be regarded as merely a remnant of earlier polytheistic views (i.e. as originally only a

¹ Mayer Lambert in the *Revue des études juives*, xxiv. p. 106 sqq., enumerates no less than ninety-five words ending in *fm*, which in his opinion are to be regarded as *pluralia tantum*.

² The Jewish grammarians call such plurals *רַבִּי הַכְּחוֹת plur. virium or virtutum*; later grammarians call them *plur. excellentiae, magnitudinis, or plur. maiestaticus*. This last name may have been suggested by the *we* used by kings when speaking of themselves (comp. already 1 Macc. 10, 19. 11, 31); and the plural used by God in Gen. 1, 26. 11, 7. Is. 6, 8 has been incorrectly explained in this way. It is, however, either *communicative* (including the attendant angels; so at all events in Is. 6, 8, comp. also Gen. 3, 22), or according to others, an indication of *the fullness of power and might* implied in *אֱלֹהִים* (see Dillmann on Gen. 1, 26); but it is best explained as a plural of *self-deliberation*. The use of the plural as a form of respectful address is quite foreign to Hebrew.

numerical plural) is at least highly improbable, and, moreover, would not explain the analogous plurals (see below). That the language has entirely rejected the idea of numerical plurality in אֱלֹהִים (whenever it denotes *one* God), is proved especially by its being almost invariably joined with a singular attribute (comp. § 132. *h*), e.g. צַדִּיק אֱלֹהִים Ps. 7, 10, and elsewhere. Accordingly, אֱלֹהִים must have been used originally not only as a numerical but also as an abstract plural (corresponding to the Latin *numen*, and our *Godhead*), and, like other abstracts of the same kind, have been transferred to a concrete single god (even of the heathen).

To the same class (and probably formed on the analogy of אֱלֹהִים) belong the plurals קְדוֹשִׁים *the Most Holy* (only of Yahweh), Hos. 12, 1. Prov. 9, 10. 30, 3 (comp. קְדוֹשִׁים אֱלֹהִים Jos. 24, 19, and the Aram. עֲלִיּוֹנִין *the Most High*, Dan. 7, 18); and probably תְּרַפִּים (usually taken in the sense of *penates*) the image of a god, used especially for obtaining oracles. Certainly in 1 Sam. 19, 13. 16 only *one* image is intended; in most other places only one image *may* be intended¹; in Zech. 10, 2 alone is it most natural to suppose a numerical plural. In Eccles. 5, 7 גְּבוּרִים *supremus* (of God) is doubtful; according to others it is a numerical plural, *superiores*.

Further, אֲדָנִים, as well as the singular אֲדֹנָי (lordship) *lord*, e.g. קָשָׁה אֲדָנִים *a cruel lord*, Is. 19, 4; אֲדֹנָי הָאָרֶץ *the lord of the land*, Gen. 42, 30, comp. Gen. 32, 20; so especially with the suffixes of the 2nd and 3rd persons אֲדָנֶיךָ, אֲדָנָיו, &c., also אֲדֹנָי (except 1 Sam. 16, 16); but in 1st sing. always אֲדֹנִי. So also בָּעָלִים (with suffixes) *lord, master* (of slaves, cattle, or inanimate things; but in the sense of *maritus*, always in the singular), e.g. בָּעָלִי Ex. 21, 29. Is. 1, 3, &c.

On the other hand, we must regard as doubtful a number of participles in the plural, which, being used as attributes of God, resemble *plurales excellentiae*; thus, עֹשֵׂי *my Maker*, Job 35, 10; עֹשֶׂה Is. 54, 5; עֹשֵׂי Ps. 149, 2; עֹשֶׂה Is. 22, 11; נֹטְתֵיהֶם *stretching them out*, Is. 42, 5; for all these forms may also be explained as singular, according to § 93. *ss*.²—נֹשְׂטֵי Is. 3, 12 might also be regarded as another instance, unless it be a numerical plural, *their oppressors*; moreover, מְרַיֵּס *him who lifteth it up*, Is. 10, 15; מְשַׁלְּחִי *him who sendeth him*, Prov. 10, 26. 22, 21. 25, 13 (in parallelism with מְרַיֵּס). These latter plurals, however (including מְרַיֵּס), may probably be more simply explained as indicating an indefinite individual, comp. letter *o* below.—For שֹׂמְרֵךְ Ps. 121, 5 (textus receptus) and בּוֹרְאֵךְ Eccles. 12, 1 (textus receptus) the singular should be read, with Baer.

¹ Even in Gen. 31, 34, notwithstanding the plural suffix in וְהַשֹּׂמֶם and עֲלֵיהֶם, since the construction of these abstracts as numerical plurals is one of the peculiarities of the E-document of the Hexateuch; comp. Gen. 20, 13. 35, 7, and § 145. *i*.

² On אֲדֹנִי (for אֲדָנִי) as a name of God, cf. § 135. *g*.

³ בָּעָלֶיךָ, which in Is. 54, 5 is in parallelism with עֹשֶׂה, must then be explained as merely formed on analogy.

- l Rem. 1. (a) Coherent substances, &c., are mostly regarded as *single*, and are, accordingly, almost always represented by nouns in the singular, comp. אֶפֶס *fine dust*, אֶשֶׁר *ashes*, בֵּר *linen*, בְּדִיל *lead*, זָהָב *gold*, כֶּסֶף *silver*, נְחֹשֶׁת *brass*, חֶלֶב *milk*, יַיִן *wine*, עֹפָר *dust*, הַיָּדָוֶה *the ground*, עֵץ *wood*. Plurals are, however, formed from some of these words expressing materials in order to denote separate portions taken from the whole in manufacture (*plurals of the result*) or parts otherwise detached from it; thus, בְּדִים *linen garments*; כֶּסֶּפִּים *silver pieces*, Gen. 42, 25. 35; נְחֹשֶׁתִּים (dual) *fetters of brass*; עֵצִים *ligna* (*timber for building or sticks for burning*); also in a wider sense, בְּדִילִים *alloy* to be separated by smelting, Is. 1, 25; עֲפָרוֹת *fragments of earth*, Prov. 8, 26, comp. Job 28, 6 זָהָב עֲפָרוֹת *dust of gold*.
- m (b) To the class of *plurals of the result* belong also a few names of natural products, when represented in an artificial condition; thus, חִטִּים *wheat* in grain (threshed wheat), as distinguished from חִטָּה *wheat* (used collectively) in the ear; comp. the same distinction between כֶּסֶּפִּים and כֶּסֶּפֶת *spelt*; עֲרֻשִׁים and עֲרֻשָׁה (the singular only preserved in the Mishna) *lentils*; שְׂעִירִים and שְׂעִירָה *barley*; also פִּשְׁתִּים *linen*, פִּשְׁתָּה (to be inferred from פִּשְׁתִּי) *flax*.
- n (c) Finally, the distinction between דָּם *blood* and דְּמִים requires to be specially noticed. The singular is always used when the blood is regarded as an organic unity, hence also of menstrual blood, and the blood of sacrifices (collected in the basin and then sprinkled), and in Num. 23, 24 of the blood gushing from wounds. On the other hand, דְּמִים as a sort of plural of the result and at the same time of local extension, denotes *blood which is shed*, when it appears as blood-stains (Is. 1, 15) or as blood-marks (so evidently in Is. 9, 4). But since blood-stains or blood-marks, as a rule, suggest blood shed in murder (although דְּמִים also denotes the blood which flows at childbirth or in circumcision), דְּמִים acquired (even in very early passages) simply the sense of a *bloody deed*, and especially of *bloodguiltiness*, Ex. 22, 1 sq. and elsewhere.
- o 2. In some few cases the plural is used to denote an indefinite singular; certainly so in Deut. 17, 5 אֶל־שַׁעְרֶיהָ *unto one of thy gates*; Jud. 12, 7 בְּעָרֵי בְּנֵי־גִלְעָד *in the cities*, i.e. in one of the cities of Gilead; Zech. 9, 9 בְּנִי־אֲחָזָת *(comp. Cant. 2, 9)*; Ex. 21, 22 יֶלְדָּהָ *(where evidently only one child is thought of, though certainly in connexion with a contingency which may be repeated)*; comp. also Eccles. 4, 10 *(if one of them fall)*.—So probably also Gen. 8, 4. 1 Sam. 17, 43. Neh. 3, 8. 6, 2; but not Gen. 19, 29, since the same document (Gen. 13, 12) makes Lot dwell *in the cities* of the Jordan valley; in Gen. 21, 7 בָּנִים denotes the class with which the action is concerned.
- p 2. When a substantive is followed by a genitive, and the compound idea thus formed is to be expressed in the plural, this is done—
- (a) Most naturally by using the plural of the *nomen regens*, e.g. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִּל *mighty men of valour* (prop. heroes of strength), 1 Chron. 7, 2. 9; so also in compounds, e.g. בְּנֵי יִמְיָי 1 Sam. 22, 7, as the plur. of בְּנֵי־יִמְיָי *Benjamite*; but also

(b) By using the plural of *both* nouns¹, e.g. בְּבוֹרֵי חֲלָלִים 1 Chron. 7, 5; *q* כְּלָאִים וּבְבוֹרֵי חֲלָלִים *and in prison houses*, Is. 42, 22; comp. Ex. 34, 1, &c. (לֶחֶט אֲבָנִים שְׁנֵי לֶחֶט אֲבָנִים) *two tables of stone*; but Ex. 31, 18 אֲבָנִים; Num. 13, 32. Deut. 1, 28. Jos. 5, 2. 6, 4. 2 Ki. 14, 14. 25, 23. Jer. 41, 16. Ezra 3, 3, &c. עַמִּי הָאֶרְצוֹת *the people of the country*; 2 Chron. 26, 14; so perhaps בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים *sons of God*, Ps. 29, 1. 89, 7 (according to others *sons of gods*); or finally even

(c) By using the plural of the *nomen rectum*; e.g. בֵּית אָבוֹת Ex. 6, 14. Num. 1, 2. 4 sqq. and elsewhere, as plur. of בֵּית אָב *father's house, family*; בֵּית הַבָּמוֹת *the houses of the high places*, 2 Ki. 17, 29 (also בְּמֵי הַבָּמוֹת 23, 19); בְּמֵי עֲצֻבֵיהֶם *the houses of their idols*, 1 Sam. 31, 9. Ezek. 46, 24; comp. also Jud. 7, 25 *the head of Oreb and Zeeb*, i.e. the heads, &c.

Rem. When a substantive (in a distributive sense) with a suffix refers back to a plural, the singular form of the substantive suffices, since the idea of plurality is already adequately expressed by the suffix, e.g. יְמִינוֹ *os* (for *ora eorum*, Ps. 17, 10; יְמִינָם *their right hand*, Ps. 144, 8 [so in the English RV.].

§ 125. Determination of Nouns in general. Determination of Proper Names.

1. A noun may either be determinate in itself, as a proper name *a* or pronoun (see below, letters *d* and *i*), or be made so by its context. In the latter case, the determination may be effected either by prefixing the article (see § 126), or by the connexion of the noun (in the construct state) with a following determinate genitive, and consequently also (according to § 33. *c*) by its union with a pronominal suffix (§ 127. *a*). It is to be taken as a fundamental rule, that the determination can only be effected in *one* of the ways here mentioned; the article cannot be prefixed to a proper name, nor to a noun followed by the genitive, nor can a proper name be used in the construct state. Deviations from this rule are either only apparent or have arisen from a corruption of the text.

Rem. Only in a few passages is a noun made expressly *indeterminate* by the addition of אֵינֶנּוּ in the sense of our indefinite article; comp. Ex. 16, 33. Jud. 9, 53. 13, 2. 1 Sam. 1, 1. 6, 7. 7, 9. 12, 27, 1. 1 Ki. 13, 11. 19, 4. 20, 13. 22, 9. 2 Ki.

¹ Cf. König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 438 sq., according to whom the plural of the principal word exercises an influence on the determining genitive.

4, 1. 7, 8. 8, 6. 12, 10. Ezek. 8, 8. 37, 16. Dan. 8, 3. 10, 5 (in 8, 13 קֹדֶשׁ i.e. *one*, viz. a *holy one*, is opposed to another).

- c It is further to be noticed, that in Hebrew the phenomenon sometimes occurs, which the Arab grammarians call *indeterminateness for the sake of amplification*; e.g. Is. 31, 8 and he shall flee מִפְּנֵי הָחֶרֶב from a sword, i.e. from an irresistible sword (God's sword); comp. Is. 28, 2 בְּיָד; 2 Sam. 6, 2 שֶׁם; Hos. 3, 1 אִשָּׁה such a woman, without doubt to be referred to the Gomer mentioned in cap. 1; Amos 6, 14 גִּוִּי; Ps. 77, 16 בְּרוֹעַ; Prov. 21, 12 צַדִּיק, if with Delitzsch it is to be referred to God; Job 8, 10 מִלִּים meaning *important words*, but in 15, 13 מִלִּין reproachful words. Comp. on this point, § 117. q, note 1, and Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, ed. 4, p. 79.

- d 2. Real *proper nouns*, as being the names of things (or persons) only *once* met with, are sufficiently determinate in themselves. Such names, therefore, as יְהוָה, דָּוִד, יַעֲקֹב, בְּנֵנֶן, קָרִים do not admit of the article¹, nor can they be in the construct state. On the other hand, not only *Gentilic* names (as denoting the *various* individuals belonging to the same class), but also all those proper names, of which the appellative sense is still sufficiently evident to the mind, or at least has been handed down from an earlier period of the language, frequently (often even as a rule) take the article (according to § 126. e), and may even be followed by a genitive.

- e Examples. Like the above-mentioned proper names of individuals, countries, and cities, so also national names, which are identical in form with the name of the founder of the race (e.g. יִשְׂרָאֵל, אֲרָם, מוֹאָב), are always determinate in themselves. Of *Gentilic* names (e.g. הָעִבְרִי the Hebrew, הָעִבְרִים the Hebrews, Gen. 40, 15; הַכְּנַעֲנִי the Canaanite) the plural מְלִשְׁתִּים, even when meaning the Philistines, is generally used without the article (but cf. 1 Sam. 4, 7, &c., הַפִּי); so always בְּמִתְרִים.—Evident appellatives (analogous to such modern names as the Hague, le Havre) are הַגִּבְעָה the hill, in the construct state נֶבֶטֶת שָׂאֵל, i.e. the Gibeah named after Saul to distinguish it from others; הָרְמָה the height; הָעֵי the heap; הַלְבָּנוֹן (prop. the white mountain) the Lebanon; הַיָּאֵר (prop. the river) the Nile; comp. Amos 8, 8 גִּיּאֹר מִצְרַיִם like the river of Egypt; הַיַּרְדֵּן the Jordan (according to Seybold, *Mittheil. und Nachr. des DPV.*, 1896, p. 11, probably, originally the drinking-place).

- f Rem. 1. In a few instances original appellatives have completely assumed the character of real proper names, and are therefore used without the article; thus

¹ Consequently, הַמְנַשֶּׁה Deut. 3, 13. Jos. 1, 12, &c. (in the Deuteronomist) in the combination הַמְנַשֶּׁה הַמְנַשֶּׁה שֶׁבָּם (for which elsewhere מְנַשֶּׁה is to be regarded not as a proper name but as a *Gentilic* name (= the tribe of the Manassites), for which in Deut. 29, 7 הַמְנַשֶּׁה שֶׁ is used, as in 10, 8 הַלֵּוִי שֶׁ the tribe of the Levites, and in Jud. 18, 1 הַדָּנִי שֶׁ the tribe of the Danites.—In Jos. 13, 7 הַמְנַשֶּׁה (like *Gentilic* names in '—') is even used adjectivally.

אלהים *God*, to denote the one true God (as elsewhere יהוה) Gen. 1, 1 and so generally in this document of the Pent. up to Ex. 6, elsewhere sometimes האלהים *gods* (comp. § 126. e); also the sing. אלה *God*, עליון *the Most High* (after אל), and יי *the Almighty* never take the article.—Moreover, אדם *Adam* from Gen. 5, 1 onwards (previously in 2, 7, &c., האדם *the first man*); שטן *Satan*, 1 Chron. 21, 1 (but Zech. 3, 1. Job 1, 6 and elsewhere השטן *the adversary*).

To the class of nouns originally appellative, which the language regards as proper names, and which consequently never take the article, belong also certain archaic words mostly used only by poets, such as שאול *Hades*, תבל *world*, תהום *ocean*, of the body of water which encircles the earth, Gen. 1, 2 and elsewhere; but Is. 63, 13. Ps. 106, 9 בתְּהוֹמוֹת *through the depths*, viz. of the Red Sea¹.

2. When nouns which the usage of the language always treats as proper names occasionally appear to be connected with a following genitive, this is really owing to an ellipse whereby the noun which really governs the genitive, i.e. the appellative idea contained in the proper name, is suppressed. So evidently in the case of יהוה צבאות as an abbreviation of the original (2 Sam. 5, 10, &c.), יהוה צבאות אלהי *Yahweh, the God of hosts*. So also in geographical names such as ארם נהרים *Aram (the region) of the two rivers*; בית לחם יהודה *Bethlehem (the city) of Judah*; אבל מַעֲכָה 2 Sam. 20, 14, &c., to distinguish it from אבל מים *Abel by the water*, 2 Chron. 16, 4; יריש גלעד 1 Sam. 11, 1, &c.; ירדן ירחו Num. 22, 1. 26, 3. 63, &c.; עפרת אבי העזרי *Jud. 8, 32 (but in 6, 24 עפרת)*; ציון קדוש יהוה *the Zion of the Holy One of Israel*, Is. 60, 14; הרקתים צופים 1 Sam. 1, 1. Some of these examples (comp. also Amos 6, 2) come very near to the actual construct state (comp. above, נַעֲרַת שְׁאֵל, since e.g. the addition of the genitive serves to distinguish the place from four others called Aram (see the Lexicon), or from another Bethlehem. Aram, Bethlehem, &c., are accordingly no longer names found only in one special sense, and therefore also are no longer proper names in the strictest sense.

3. Of the pronouns, the personal pronouns proper (the separate pronouns, § 32) are always determinate in themselves, since they can denote only definite individuals (the 3rd person, also definite things). For the same reason the demonstrative pronouns (§ 34) are also determinate in themselves, when they stand *alone* (as equivalent to substantives), either as subject (Gen. 5, 29) or as predicate (e.g. היום זה *this is the day*, Jud. 4, 14; אלה הדברים *these are the words*, Deut. 1, 1), or as object (e.g. אֶת־יִצְחָק 2 Sam. 13, 17), or as genitive

¹ That various other words, such as אנוש *man*, צלמח *deep darkness*, רֶחַץ *prince*, שָׂדֶה *field*, הַעֲשִׂיָה *effectual working*, are always found without the article is not to be attributed to any special archaism, but is to be explained from the fact that they belong solely to poetic language, which avoids the article; in other cases, such as תרדמה *deep sleep*, there is no occasion for the article in the passages we possess.

יהוה צבאות
is "Yahweh
militant".

(מִחִירָה 1 Ki. 21, 2), or finally when joined to a preposition (לְמִחִירָה Gen. 2, 23; מִבְּרָה 1 Sam. 16, 8, see § 102. g).

- k So also the personal pronouns הֵוא, הִיא, הֵם, הֵנָּה, הֵנָּה when they are used as demonstratives (= *is, ea, id, ille, &c.*) are always determinate in themselves, e.g. הֵוא הַדָּבָר *this is the thing*, Gen. 41, 28. They are made determinate by the article, when they are joined like adjectives (see § 126. u) with a determinate substantive, e.g. הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה *this man*; הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה *these men*; בַּיָּמִים הַהֵמָּה וּבַיָּמֵי הַהֵם *in those days, and in that time*, Joel 4, 1. The demonstrative, however, even in this case, is frequently used *without* the article, as being sufficiently determinate in itself.

§ 126. Determination by Means of the Article.

- a 1. The article (הַ, הָ, הֵ, § 35) was originally, as in other languages (clearly in the Romance; comp. also *δ, ἡ, τό* in Homer), a demonstrative pronoun. The demonstrative force of the article, apart from its occasional use as a relative pronoun (see § 138. i), appears now, however, only (a) in a few standing phrases, and (b) in a certain class of statements or exclamations.

- b (a) Comp. הַיּוֹם *this day, hodie* (§ 100. c); הַלַּיְלָה *this night*, Gen. 19, 34; הַפֶּעַם *this time*, Gen. 2, 23; הַשָּׁנָה *this year* (= in this year) Is. 37, 30. Jer. 28, 16.

(b) includes those instances in which the article, mostly when prefixed to a participle, joins on a new statement concerning a preceding noun. Although such participles, &c. are no doubt primarily regarded always as in apposition to a preceding substantive, the article nevertheless has in some of these examples almost the force of הֵוא (הִיא, הֵם, הֵנָּה) as the subject of a noun-clause; e.g. Ps. 19, 10 *the judgements of the Lord are true* . . . , verse 11 וְגו' הַנִּחְמָדִים *prop. the more to be desired than gold*, i.e. *they are more to be desired, or even they, that are more to be desired*¹, &c.; comp. Gen. 49, 21. Is. 40, 22 sq. 44, 27 sq. 46, 6. Amos 2, 7. 5, 7. Ps. 33, 15. 49, 7 הַבְּטָחִים in the parallel half of the verse continued by a finite verb); Ps. 104, 3. Job 6, 16. 28, 4. 30, 3. 41, 25 and frequently. When such a participle has another co-ordinate with it, the latter is used *without* the article, since according to the above it strictly speaking represents a second predicate, and as such, according to letter i, remains indeterminate; e.g. Job 5, 10 *who giveth (הַחֵן) rain, &c., and sendeth (הַשֶּׁלֶחַ), &c.*

- c The article is sometimes used with similar emphasis before a substantive, which serves as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 140. d); e.g. Deut. 32, 4 הָאֵלֹהִים הַחַיִּים *i.e. as a fresh statement (not in apposition to the preceding dative), really equivalent to he is a rock, perfect is his work (i.e. whose work is perfect)*; comp. Ps. 18, 31.

¹ On the analogous use of the article before participles which have a verbal suffix, as in Ps. 18, 33 and elsewhere, comp. above, § 116. f.

2. The article is, generally speaking, employed to determine a *d* substantive wherever it is required by Greek and English; thus:

(a) When a person or thing already spoken of is mentioned again, and is consequently more definite to the mind of the hearer or reader; e.g. Gen. 1, 3 *and God said, Let there be light*: verse 4 *and God saw the light* (אֶת־הָאוֹר); 1 Ki. 3, 24 *fetch me a sword: and they brought the sword*; Eccles. 9, 15. (In 2 Sam. 12, 2 therefore לְעִשְׂרִי must be read.)

(b) With a title understood and recognized by every one, e.g. הַפֶּלֶאֱשֶׁת הַבְּלִיָּה δ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών: Gen. 35, 8 *under the oak* (the well-known oak which was there).

(c) With appellatives to denote persons or natural objects which are unique, e.g. הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל *the high priest*, הַשֶּׁשֶׁשׁ הַשָּׁמֶשׁ *the sun*, הָאָרֶץ *the earth*.

(d) When ideas relating to whole classes are restricted (simply by *e* usage) to particular individuals (like δ ποιητής, meaning Homer) or things, e.g. שָׁטָן *adversary*, הָשָׁטָן *the adversary, Satan*; בַּעַל *lord*, בַּעַל Ba'al as proper name of the god; הָאָדָם *the (first) man, Adam*; יְהוָה *the one true God* (comp. also δ Χριστός in the New Testament); also הַנָּהָר *the river*, i.e. *the Euphrates*; הַכְּכַר *the circle*, sc. of the Jordan, *the Jordan plain* [Gen. 19, 17, &c.].

(e) As a rule, with the vocative, e.g. 2 Sam. 14, 4 הַמֶּלֶךְ הַיְשָׁע *O king*; Zech. 3, 8 יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל *O Joshua the high priest*; 1 Sam. 17, 58. 24, 9. 2 Ki. 9, 5; in the plural, Is. 42, 18. Joel 1, 2. 13; but cf. also Jos. 10, 12. Is. 1, 2 (שָׁמַיִם and אָרֶץ); 23, 16. Hos. 13, 14. Joel 1, 5. Eccles. 10, 17. 11, 9 (see König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 6). The vocative occurs *without* the article in Is. 22, 2, since it has been already defined by a preceding accusative.

Rem. Strictly speaking in all these cases the substantive with the article *f* is really in apposition to the personal pronoun of the 2nd person, which is either expressly mentioned or virtually present (in the imperative), e.g. 1 Sam. 17, 58 *thou, the young man*. But such passages as Is. 42, 18, where the vocative precedes the imperative, prove that in such cases the substantive originally in apposition eventually acquired the value of a complete clause.

(f) With words denoting classes (see more particularly under *g* letter *l*).

(g) In a peculiar way, to specify persons or things, which are

¹ On the subsequent change of שָׁטָן, אָדָם, אֱלֹהִים into real proper names by the omission of the article, cf. above, § 125. *f*.

so far definite as to be naturally thought of in connexion with a given case, and must be assumed accordingly to be there (see letters *q-s*).

(*h*) With adjectives (also ordinal numbers and demonstrative pronouns used adjectivally) which are joined to substantives determined in some way (see letter *u*).

h Rem. The article may be omitted in *poetry* in all the above-mentioned cases; in general it occurs in poetry far less frequently than in prose. Its use or omission probably often rests on rhythmical grounds¹; it is omitted also for rhetorical reasons. Comp. e.g. אָרְיָן for הָאָרְיָן Ps. 2, 2; מַלְכִּים as vocative, verse 10; מַלְכֵּה for הַמַּלְכֵּה 21, 2; וְנִרְאָה שְׂמֹךְ נֹדֶל (contrary to letters *u, v*) 99, 3. In the instances in which the ה of the article is omitted after a prefix (§ 35. *n*), the vowel of the article is often retained after the prefix even in poetry, e.g. בְּשִׁמְיָם Ps. 2, 4 and elsewhere.

i (*i*) On the other hand, the article is always omitted when a person or thing is to be represented as indefinite (or indefinable) or as yet unknown; consequently also before the predicate, since this is from its nature always a general term, under which the subject is included, e.g. Gen. 29, עוֹד הַיּוֹם נָדָל as *yet the day is great*, i.e. it is yet high day; 33, 13. 40, 18. 41, 26. Is. 66, 3.

k Rem. As exceptions to the above rule it is usual to regard those examples in which a determinate adjective or participle (equivalent to a relative clause) is used apparently as a predicate, e.g. Gen. 2, 11 הָיָא הַפֶּסֶבֶת *it is the compassing*, i.e. *that is it which compasseth*; 42, 6. 45, 12. Ex. 9, 27. Deut. 3, 21. 8, 18. 11, 7. 1 Sam. 4, 16. Is. 14, 27 (cf. in Greek, e.g. St. Mat. 10, 20, where Winer, *Gram. des neutest. Sprachidioms*, § 58, 2, Rem., explains of *καλοῦντες* as a predicate with the article). In reality, however, these supposed predicates are rather subjects (acc. to § 116. *q*), and the only peculiarity of these cases is that the subject is not subsumed under a general idea, but that the predicate is equated with it.

l 3. The use of the article to determine the *class* is more extensive in Hebrew than in most other languages. In this case the article indicates universally known, clearly circumscribed, and therefore well defined classes of persons or things. The special cases to be considered are—

(*a*) The employment of general names as collectives in the singular, to denote the *sum total* of individuals belonging to the class (which may, however, be done just as well by the plural); e.g. *the righteous, the wicked man*, Eccles. 3, 17; *the woman*, i.e. *the female sex*, 7, 26; הָאֹיֵב *the enemy*, i.e. *the enemies*, Ps. 9, 7; הָאֹרֵב *the liar in wait*, i.e. *the liars in wait*; הָחֹלָצִי *the armed man*, i.e. *soldiers*;

¹ Cf. the useful statistics of J. Ley in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 2te Abteilung, 1891, Heft 7-9.

הַחֲמִשָּׁה the rearward; הַמְשָׁחִית the spoiler, 1 Sam. 13, 17¹; so also (as in English) with names of animals, when something is asserted of them, which applies to the whole species, e.g. 2 Sam. 17, 10 as the courage of הַלֵּוֹנִי the lion. Especially also with Gentilic names, e.g. the Canaanite, Gen. 13, 7 (comp. 15, 19 sq.); so in English the Russian, the Turk, &c., in Attic writers ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, ὁ Σπαρτιάτης, &c.

(b) Names of materials known everywhere, the elements and other words denoting classes, even though only a part and not the whole of them is considered, in which case in other languages, as e.g. in English, the article is usually omitted (comp., however, our to fall into the water, into the fire, &c.), e.g. Gen. 13, 2 and Abram was very rich בַּכֶּסֶף וּבַחֶבֶץ in cattle, in silver and in gold; Jos. 11, 9 and he burnt their chariots בָּאֵשׁ with fire; comp. Gen. 6, 14. 41, 42 (unless this means, the chain necessarily belonging to the official dress); Ex. 2, 3. 31, 4 (35, 32). Is. 1, 22, &c. Similarly the article is used with terms of measurement, as הָאֶפֶס Ex. 16, 36, &c.: הַחֹמֶר and הַבֵּת Ezek. 45, 11; הָעֶמֶךְ Ex. 16, 22; בַּחֲבֵל 2 Sam. 8, 2.

(c) The expression of abstract ideas of every kind, since they are likewise used to represent whole classes of attributes or conditions, physical or moral defects, &c.; e.g. Prov. 25, 5 (בְּצִדָּק) Gen. 19, 11 and they smote the men . . . בְּפִנְיָהִם with blindness; Is. 60, 2 הַחֹשֶׁךְ darkness; Amos 4, 9, &c.

(d) Comparisons, since the object compared is treated not (as usually in English) individually but as a general term, e.g. Is. 1, 18 white בְּשֹׁלֶג as snow, בְּצֹמֶר as wool; red בְּתוֹלַע like crimson; Is. 34, 4 and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; comp. Num. 11, 12. Jud. 8, 18. 16, 9 as פְּתִיל־הַנֶּעֱרַת a string of tow is broken; 1 Sam. 26, 20. 1 Ki. 14, 15. Is. 10, 18. 24, 20. 27, 10. 29, 8. 53, 6. Nah. 3, 15. Ps. 33, 7. 49, 15; comp. also such examples as Gen. 19, 28. Jud. 14, 6, where the object compared is determined by a determinate genitive which follows (according to § 127).

Examples of indeterminate comparisons, such as כְּבִּבְרוֹר Ps. 17, 12, Job 16, 14, כְּבָאֵב 31, 18, כְּנֹכַח 38, 3, are rare, and perhaps due only to the Masora, —so at least in the case of singulars, while in such plurals as those in Gen. 42, 30. Joel 2, 4, 7, the omission of the article may be explained by the ordinary rules. On the other hand, the article is regularly omitted, when the object compared is already defined by means of an attribute (or relative clause, Ps. 17, 12), e.g. Is. 16, 2 כְּעוֹף טִוֵּר as wandering birds, (as) a scattered nest (but comp. 10, 14 בְּצִנֹּחַ); 14, 19. 29, 5 כְּמִץ עֵבֶר (but Ps. 1, 4 בְּמִץ); Jer. 2, 30. Prov. 27, 8. Job 30, 14.

4. Peculiar to Hebrew² is the employment of the article to denote a single person or thing (primarily one which is as yet unknown, and

¹ But in Ex. 12, 23 הַמֹּר is either to be explained as the destroyer (now mentioned for the first time) according to letter *g*, or a particular angel is meant whose regular function it was to inflict punishments. Others again take הַמֹּר even in Ex. 12, 23 impersonally = destruction.

² Comp., however, analogous examples in Biblical Aramaic in Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 79. *f*, e.g. Dan. 2, 14. 3, 2, and elsewhere.

therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances. In such cases in English the indefinite article is mostly used.

r Thus Amos 5, 19 *as if a man did flee from a lion* (הַלֵּאָוִן, i.e. the particular lion pursuing him at the time), *and a bear* (הַדִּבִּי) *met him*, &c., comp. 3, 12. 1 Ki. 20, 36 (John 10, 12); also Gen. 8, 7 sq. 14, 13 (הַפֶּלִיט, i.e. *one that had escaped*, the particular one who came just then; so also Ezek. 24, 26. 33, 21; comp. 2 Sam. 15, 13); Gen. 15, 1. 18, 7 *the servant*, who is regarded as being constantly at hand and awaiting his commands; comp. 2 Sam. 17, 17 (but הַעֲבָדִים Num. 11, 27 is used like הַפֶּלִיט above); בִּפְסוֹקִים Gen. 28, 11, according to Dillmann, upon the place suitable for passing the night, or the right place, but it may possibly also refer to the sanctuary of Bethel afterwards so sacred and celebrated; Gen. 50, 26. Ex. 2, 15. 3, 2. 21, 20 (2 Sam. 23, 21). Lev. 24, 10 (Samaritan הַיִּזְרָאֵל without the article); Num. 17, 11. 21, 9. 25, 6. Deut. 19, 5. Jos. 2, 15. Jud. 4, 18. 8, 25. 13, 19. 16, 19. 19, 29. 20, 16. 1 Sam. 17, 34. 19, 13. 21, 10. 2 Sam. 17, 17. 1 Ki. 6, 8. Is. 7, 14 (הַעַלְמָה), i.e. *the particular maiden*, through whom the prophet's announcement shall be fulfilled; we should say *a maiden* [cf. Driver on 1 Sam. 1, 4. 6, 8. 19, 13].

s So always to write in the book (or on the scroll, Num. 5, 23. Jer. 32, 10), i.e. not in the book already in use, but in the book which is to be devoted to that purpose, equivalent to *in a book, on a scroll*, Ex. 17, 14. 1 Sam. 10, 25. Job 19, 23. Especially instructive for this use of the article is the phrase הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, which does not simply refer back to the previous narrative in the sense of *the same day*, but is used exactly like our *one day* (properly meaning on the particular day when it happened, i.e. *on a certain day*), 1 Sam. 1, 4. 14, 1. 2 Ki. 4, 8. 11. 18. Job 1, 6. 13. In Gen. 39, 11 even הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה פְּרִיָּוִם.

t The article is sometimes used in this way before collectives in the singular, which are not meant to denote (like the examples given under letter *t*) a whole class, but only that part of it which applies to the given case; thus הַצֶּרֶדָה Ex. 23, 28; הַבְּחֻשׁ Num. 21, 7.

u 5. When a substantive is defined by the article, or by a suffix, or by a following genitive determinate in any way (see the examples below), the attribute belonging to it (whether adjective, participle, ordinal, or demonstrative pronoun) necessarily takes the article (see, however, the Rem.), e. g. Gen. 10, 12 הַגְּבִלָה הַגְּדוֹלָה *the great city*; 28, 19 הַמָּקוֹם הַהוּא *that place*; Gen. 2, 2 בַּיּוֹם הַשִּׁבְעִי *on the seventh day*; Deut. 3, 24 יָדְךָ הַחֲזָקָה *thy strong hand*. A genitive following the substantive may, according to § 127, be determined either by the article, e. g. 1 Sam. 25, 25 הָאִישׁ הַבְּלִעַל הַזֶּה *this worthless man* (prop. *this man of worthlessness*; comp. also such examples as 2 Chron. 36, 18, where the article is prefixed only to a second genitive following the noun); or as a proper name, e. g. Deut. 11, 7 מְעִשֵׂה הַיְּהוָה הַגָּדוֹל *the great work*

of the Lord; or by a suffix, e.g. Is. 36, 9 *עֲבָדֵי אֲדֹנִי הַפְּתָנִים* *the least of my master's servants.*

When several attributes (either connected by *Wāw* or added by *v* asyndeton) follow a determinate substantive, each of them takes the article, e.g. Deut. 10, 17 *הָאֵל הַגָּדֹל הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא* *the great God, the mighty, and the terrible.* Comp. also Ex. 3, 3. Deut. 1, 19, in both of which places a demonstrative with the article also follows the adjective¹.

Rem. 1. The article is, however, not infrequently used also—

(a) With the attribute alone, when it is added to an originally indefinite substantive as a subsequent limitation; so especially with ordinals after *יּוֹם*, e.g. Gen. 1, 31 (comp. 2, 3. Ex. 20, 10, and elsewhere) *יּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי* *the sixth day* (prop. *a day* namely *the sixth*; but *יּוֹם שֵׁנִי* *a second day*, Gen. 1, 8); Ex. 12, 15 *מִיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן* *from the first day onward* (not before Dan. 10, 12 and Neh. 8, 18 is *מִיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן* used instead of it; on the other hand, the article is *always* found after *בְּ*, hence *בְּיּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי*, &c.); in Jud. 6, 25 the text is evidently corrupt (see verse 26).—Especially also in certain frequently recurring combinations, as in particularizing gates (Jer. 38, 14. Ezek. 9, 2, and elsewhere; Zech. 14, 10) or courts 1 Ki. 7, 8, 12, and elsewhere; Ezek. 40, 28), and very often when the attribute consists of a participle, e.g. Deut. 2, 23. Jud. 21, 19. 1 Sam. 25, 10. Jer. 27, 3. 46, 16 *הַחֶרֶב הַיּוֹנֵה* *the sword which oppresses*; Ezek. 14, 22. Zech. 11, 2 *K'ih*. Prov. 26, 18. Ps. 119, 21.

Of the other examples, Gen. 21, 29 (where, however, the Samaritan Pentateuch *x* reads *הַכְּבָשׂוֹת*, 41, 26 (but cf. verse 4), Num. 11, 25. Jud. 16, 27. 1 Sam. 17, 17 and 20, 3 may at any rate be explained on the ground that the preceding cardinal number is equivalent to a determinant; in Gen. 1, 21. 28, 9, 10, and elsewhere, the substantive is already determined by *בְּלִי*, and in 1 Sam. 14, 29 (*דָּבִישׁ*) by *מָעֵט*.—In 1 Sam. 12, 23. 2 Sam. 12, 2. 4. Is. 7, 20 (where, however, *הַשִּׁבְיָה* might also be understood as a subsequent explanation of *בְּתַעַר*) and Neh. 9, 35, the omission of the article after the preposition is certainly due merely to the Masora. In 1 Sam. 16, 23. Zech. 4, 7. Ps. 104, 18, the omission of the article (before *וְ*, *הַ*) may be due to a regard for euphony (see letter *s* below).

¹ The demonstrative used adjectivally is generally placed *after* the adjective proper; in such cases as *הָעָם הַגָּדוֹל הַזֶּה* the adjective forms a further (fresh) addition to *הָעָם הַזֶּה*.

² Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, 3rd ed., § 209.—The omission of the article from the substantive is not to be regarded in *this* instance as an indication of late style, and consequently cannot be put forward as a proof of the late origin of the 'Priestly Code' (comp. Dillmann on Gen. 1, 31, and especially Driver in the *Journal of Philology*, xi. 229 sq., against Giesebrecht in *ZAW.* 1881, p. 265 sq.). On the other hand, the common omission of the article from the substantive before a determinate adjective (e.g. *בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ הַגָּדוֹל* *the great synagogue*, in the Hebrew of the Mishna) is certainly a later idiom.

On the other hand, in 1 Sam. 6, 18 (to be read 'הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה), 17, 12 (הַיְּהוָה is a later addition). 19, 22 (comp. the LXX). 2 Ki. 20, 13 (cf. Is. 39, 2). Jer. 6, 20. 17, 2. 32, 14. 40, 3 *Kth*. Ezek. 2, 3 (omit מִיָּמִים with Cornill). Mic. 7, 11. Ps. 62, 4, either the text is corrupt, or the expression incorrect.

γ (b) No article with the attribute, while the substantive is determined either by the article, or a suffix, or a following genitive. Thus the article is sometimes omitted with demonstratives, since they are already to a certain extent determined by their meaning (comp. also the Mēša' inscription, l. 3, זאת הבטת *this high place*); thus with הוּא Gen. 19, 33 (evidently for euphony, and so probably often); 30, 16. 32, 23. 1 Sam. 19, 10; with הוּא Gen. 38, 21; with הוּא Ps. 12, 8 (according to the Masora הוּא is a relative pronoun here, as always elsewhere); with הוּא 1 Sam. 2, 23, according to the present corrupt text (the original reading יהוה became פלעם אלהים, and פלעם אלהים was then corrupted to הוּא); so, almost without exception, when the substantive is determined only by a suffix, e.g. Jos. 2, 20. Jud. 6, 14. 2 Ki. 1, 2 and 8, 8 sq., where חלי, as in Jer. 10, 19, arises by contraction from חליי, or we should simply read חלי (in all these passages with וְ); Gen. 24, 8 (with זאת); Ex. 10, 1. 1 Ki. 22, 23. Jer. 31, 21 (with אלה).

z Of the other remaining examples Is. 11, 9 explains itself; the direct connexion of the attribute with its substantive is interrupted by the insertion of לִי. In Ezek. 34, 12. Hag. 1, 4. Ps. 143, 10. Cant. 6, 12 (?) the substantive is also (see above) determined by a suffix, and consequently the demonstrative is less closely attached; the same applies to Gen. 37, 2. 42, 19. 43, 14. Ps. 18, 18, except that in these passages the omission of the article before ר, נ, ע may at the same time be due to considerations of euphony (as also in Jos. 16, 1 before ע, Gen. 7, 11 cf. Jos. 11, 8. Am. 6, 2. Num. 14, 37 before ר, 28, 4. Ezek. 10, 9 before נ, 21, 19 before פ)¹. In Num. 28, 4. 1 Sam. 13, 17 sq. (אמר) and 2 Ki. 25, 16 (שנים) after a determinate substantive), the attribute again, being a numeral, is determinate in itself (see above, letter x); finally, in 2 Chron. 26, 15 בְּחַצְיוֹתָם and בְּמַאֲבְּנֵיהֶם are to be read, as in Jer. 2, 21 הַנֶּפֶץ for הַנֶּפֶץ, in 22, 26 אֶרֶץ for הָאֶרֶץ; in 2 Sam. 6, 3 omit חֲרִשָּׁה, and in Ezek. 39, 27 omit רִבִּים. Without any apparent reason the article is omitted in Dan. 8, 13 and 11, 31.

aa 2. When, as in Mic. 7, 12 (אֵין הוּא *in that day*!), the article is omitted from both substantive and demonstrative, and in Ezra 3, 12, the demonstrative even precedes הַיְּהוָה equivalent to הַיְּהוָה, this is obviously due in both cases to a radical corruption of the text (not only in the words quoted). In Jos. 9, 12 לֶחֶם is either in apposition to the independent demonstrative הַזֶּה (= *this our bread*, &c.), as in verse 13 נֹאדִיּוֹת is to אֵלֶּה, or they are complete sentences, *this is our bread*, &c. So also in Ex. 32, 1 מֹשֶׁה (= *that [iste] Moses*, &c.), in 1 Sam. 17, 55 הַנֶּעַר, in Ps. 48, 15 אֱלֹהִים are to be taken in apposition to הַזֶּה. On Ps. 68, 8 and Is. 23, 13, comp. § 136. d.

¹ The same reason no doubt also favoured the omission of the article before הוּא and אֵלֶּה, as also in such cases as 1 Ki. 10, 8 (where a vowel precedes the הוּא). Also in Is. 23, 7 (*is this your joyous . . .*!) the article is omitted before עֲלִיקָה probably only for euphony.

§ 127. *The Noun determined by a following Determinate Genitive.*

When a genitive, determined in any way, follows a *nomen regens*, *a* it also determines the *nomen regens*, which, according to § 89. *a*, is always in the construct state. Moreover, every pronominal suffix attached to a substantive is, according to § 33. *c*, to be considered as a genitive determinate by nature. An independent genitive may be determinate—

(*a*) By its character as a *proper name* (according to § 125. *a*), e. g. *דְּבַר יְהוָה* *the word of the Lord*.

(*b*) By having the article, e. g. *אִישׁ הַמִּלְחָמָה* (prop. the man of the war) *the soldier* (but *אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה* Jos. 17, 1, *a soldier*); *אֲנָשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה* Num. 31, 49, *the soldiers*; *דְּבַר הַנְּבִיא* *the word of the prophet*, Jer. 28, 9 (but e. g., on the other hand, *מִצְוֹת אֲנָשִׁים מִלְפָּנָה* *a commandment of men which hath been taught*, Is. 29, 13; *דְּבַר שֶׁקֶר* *word of falsehood*, Prov. 29, 12).

(*c*) By the addition of a pronominal suffix (see above), e. g. *בֵּית־אָבִי* *my father's house*.

(*d*) By construction with another genitive determined in some way, e. g. Gen. 3, 2 *מִפְּרִי עֵץ הַגָּן* *of the fruit of the trees of the garden*. Thus in Is. 10, 12 four, and in 21, 17 even five, members of a series are determined by a concluding determinate genitive.

Rem. 1. The above explains also the various meanings of *כָּל* (prop. a substantive *b* in the sense of *aggregate, whole*), according as it is followed by a determinate or indeterminate genitive. In the former case *כָּל* has the meaning of *the entirety*, i. e. *all, the whole* (like the French *tous les hommes, toute la ville*), e. g. *כָּל־הָאָרֶץ* *the whole* (prop. the entirety of the) *earth*, *כָּל־הָאָדָם* *all men*¹; cf. also Ex. 1, 22 (*כָּל־הַבָּנִים* *all sons*, *כָּל־הַבָּתִּים* *all daughters*); 18, 22. Num. 15, 13. Jer. 4, 29, and cases like Num. 4, 23. 47. 21, 8 where *כָּל* is followed by a singular participle with the article. On the other hand, before an indeterminate genitive *כָּל* is used in the more indefinite (individualizing) sense of *of all kinds, any* (comp. *tout homme, à tout prix*), or distributively *each, every*, e. g. *כָּל־עֵץ* *every (kind of) tree*, Gen. 2, 9; comp. 4, 22. 24, 10. 1 Chron. 29, 2; *כָּל־דָּבָר* *any thing*, Jud. 19, 19; *כָּל־יּוֹם* *every day, every time*, Ps. 7, 12.

It is, however, to be observed—

(*a*) That the article may in this case also (see § 126. *h*) be omitted in poetic style, although the substantive in question is to be regarded as determinate, e. g. *כָּל־שְׁלֹחַנוֹת* *all (the) tables*, Is. 28, 8.

¹ *כָּל־הָאָדָם* being a collective; in itself *כָּל־הָאָדָם* could also mean *the whole man*.

(b) That the meaning *every* is frequent even before singulars used collectively; afterwards the idea of *quisque* passes naturally into that of *totality*, e.g. *כָּל־חַי* *each living thing*, i.e. *every* (not *every kind of*) *living thing*; *כָּל־בָּשָׂר* *all flesh*, i.e. *all men* or *all living creatures* (with the article only in Gen. 7, 15 before a relative clause, and in Is. 40, 6); sometimes also *כָּל־עֵץ* *all trees*, *כָּל־עוֹף* *all birds*; finally—

(c) That before the names of members of the human body, *כָּל־* frequently (as being determinate in itself) denotes the entirety, e.g. Is. 1, 5 *the whole head*, *the whole heart* (the sense required by the context, not *every head*, &c., which the expression *in itself* might also mean); 9, 11. 2 Ki. 23, 3. Ezek. 29, 7 *all* (i.e. *the whole of*) *their shoulders* . . . *all* (*the whole of*) *their loins*; 36, 5.—On *כָּל־* with a suffix when it follows a noun in apposition (e.g. Is. 9, 8 *הָעָם כָּל־וְהָעָם* *the people, all of it*, i.e. *the whole nation*, more emphatic than *כָּל־הָעָם*; cf. Driver on 2 Sam. 2, 9), as well as when it follows absolutely in the genitive (= *all men*, *every one*, e.g. Gen. 16, 12)¹, see the Lexicon.

d 2. Gentile names (or patronymics), derived from compound proper names (consisting of a nomen regens and genitive), are determined by inserting the article before the second part of the compound (since it contains the original genitive), e.g. *בְּנֵי־יְמִינִי* (see § 86. 5) *a Benjamite*; *בְּנֵי־הַיְמִינִי* Jud. 3, 15 and elsewhere, *the Benjamite*; *בְּנֵי־הַלְחָמִי* *the Bethlehemite*, 1 Sam. 16, 1 and elsewhere (comp., however, 1 Chron. 27, 12 *רֵאשֵׁי בְנֵי־יְמִינִי*); *בְּנֵי־הַשְּׁמִיטִי* *the Beth-shemite*, 1 Sam. 6, 14; *אֲבִי הָעֵצָרִי* *the Abiesrite*, Jud. 6, 11 and elsewhere, cf. 1 Ki. 16, 34.

e 3. In a few instances the nomen regens appears to be used indefinitely notwithstanding a following determinate genitive; it is not so, however, in Gen. 16, 7, where the reference is to a well-known fountain; 21, 28, where in the original context there must have been some reason for *the seven ewe lambs of the flock*; 2 Sam. 12, 30 *the spoil found in the city*; but probably (unless the article is to be omitted as a textual error) it is so in Lev. 14, 34 *in a house*, &c.; Deut. 22, 19 *a virgin of Israel*; 1 Sam. 4, 12 *a man of Benjamin*; so also in 1 Sam. 20, 20 *three arrows*; 2 Sam. 23, 11 *חֲלָצֶת הָעֵדָה* *a plot of ground* (but see Gen. 33, 19. Jos. 24, 32); Jud. 13, 6. Jer. 13, 4. 41, 16. Ps. 113, 9. Prov. 25, 1, and repeatedly in Cant. (1, 11. 13 sq. 5, 13. 7, 3. 8, 2; 2, 1. 3. 9). On the other hand, *שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלֹת* in the titles of Psalms 120 to 134 (except 121, 1 *שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלֹת*) was most probably originally the title of a collection, in the sense of '*the pilgrimage-songs*' (according to § 124. r), and was subsequently added to these Psalms severally, so Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 59.

f 4. The deviations mentioned under letter e, from a fundamental rule of syntax, are in some cases open to suspicion on textual grounds, but much more doubtful are the instances in which the article is found before a noun already determined in some other way, as—

(a) Before a noun which appears to be determined by a following independent determinate genitive. The least questionable are the instances in which the genitive is a *proper name*, since these may be elliptical forms of expression like the apparent construction of proper names with a genitive, noticed in § 125. h, e.g. Num. 21, 14 *הַמְּדִבְרָה בְּנֵי־אֶרְנוֹן* *the valleys*, namely *the valleys of Arnon*; 2 Ki. 23, 17 *הַמְּדִבְרָה בְּנֵי־אֶרְנוֹן*.

¹ In Ezra 10, 17 instead of *כָּל־הָאֲנָשִׁים* read simply *אֲנָשִׁים*.

the altar, namely the altar of Bethel (i.e. with the suppression of the real nomen regens, מִזְבֵּחַ without the article; by the pointing הַמִּזְבֵּחַ the Masora evidently intends to allow the choice either of reading הַמִּזְבֵּחַ or correcting it to מִזְבֵּחַ); הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֵל the God of Beth-el¹ (equivalent to הָאֵל בֵּית־אֵל, Gen. 31, 13; הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֵל the king of Assyria, Is. 36, 16 (probably a scribal error due to verse 13; it does not occur in the parallel passage, 2 Ki. 18, 31), comp. 2 Ki. 25, 11. Jer. 38, 6; in the vocative, Jer. 48, 32. Lam. 2, 13. On the other hand, שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ Gen. 24, 67 is no doubt only a subsequent insertion; so also יִשְׂרָאֵל 2 Sam. 20, 23. 2 Ki. 7, 13, הַתְּמִיד Dan. 8, 13, and עֶרֶד הַנִּבְיָא 2 Chron. 15, 8. In Ex. 9, 18 read with the Samaritans לְמִיּוֹם; in 2 Sam. 19, 25 לָכֵת might possibly be taken in apposition to לִמְן הַיּוֹם.

A similar ellipse must also be assumed in 2 Ki. 23, 17 *the sepulchre is the sepulchre of the man of God* (but most probably קֶבֶר has dropped out after הַקֶּבֶר) and Ps. 123, 4 (comp., however, the LXX, and observe that in the parallel member the genitive is paraphrased by לְ).—In Jos. 3, 14 הַבְּרִית has been added to the original הָאָרֶן by a redactor; comp. similar syntactically impossible additions in verses 11 and 17 (also in 1 Sam. 4, 3 and elsewhere, where the LXX still had simply יהוה); in יהוה הַיָּחִיד Jud. 16, 14 the Masora evidently combines two different readings הַיָּחִיד and הָאֶרֶץ; and similarly in Jer. 25, 26 (where הָאֶרֶץ was only subsequently introduced into the text), the two readings הַמִּמְלָכֹת and הָאֵל are combined.—In Jos. 8, 11. 1 Ki. 14, 24. Jer. 31, 40. Ezek. 45, 16 the article, being usual after כָּל־, has been mechanically prefixed, and so also in 2 Chron. 8, 16 after עֶרֶד; in 2 Ki. 9, 4 the second הַנֶּעֱרָ (instead of נֶעֱרָ) is occasioned by the first; in Ezek. 7, 7 מְהוּכָה belongs as a nominative to what follows; in Ezra 8, 29 the meaning perhaps is *in the chambers, in the house of the Lord*, or the article is to be omitted; in 1 Chron. 15, 27 the text is manifestly corrupt.

Of another kind are the instances in which a determinate noun is followed by *h* a definition of the material *in apposition* (hence, not in the genitive; comp. § 131), e.g. Zech. 4, 10 הָאֵכָה הַכֶּבֶל *the weight, the lead*, i.e. *the leaden weight*; Ex. 39, 17. 2 Ki. 16, 14. הַנְּחֹשֶׁת, both here and in verse 17, is probably only a later addition, while הַמַּסְנֵרוֹת הַמִּכְנֹת in verse 17 has arisen from a confusion of two readings, הַמַּסְנֵרוֹת and הַמִּכְנֹת. In Jer. 32, 12 also רִמְזָנָה (unless the article is simply to be omitted) is in apposition to הַפֶּסֶף.

(b) Before a noun with a suffix (which likewise represents a determinate genitive; *i* see above, at the beginning of this section). This does not apply to cases in which a verbal (i.e. accusative) suffix is affixed to a participle which has the article, e.g. הַמִּבְרָה Is. 9, 12, *the one smiting him*; in Deut. 8, 15. 13, 6 also הֵן is a verbal suffix, but hardly the הֵן in הָעֵשָׂה for הָעֵשָׂה Job 40, 19, nor the הֵן in הַיָּלְדָה Dan. 11, 6; § 116. g. In הָעֶרְבֶּקֶד Lev. 27, 23, the suffix, as appears from verses 1. 3. 5. 7. 13,

¹ According to Philippi (*St. Constr.*, p. 38) בֵּית־אֵל is rather a case of 'sub-position' in the accusative, as also הַדֶּרֶךְ הַחֲתָלָן Ezek. 47, 15 (for which, however, in 48, 1 there is the correct reading הַדֶּרֶךְ הַחֲתָלָן) *by the way to Hethlon*; and in fact, Ezek. 47, 15 may without difficulty be explained in this way; so שֵׁשׁ Ex. 39, 27 as an accusative of the material.

must have entirely lost its meaning (comp. also § 128. *d*).—Of the remaining examples פְּנֵי־רַחֵם Is. 24, 2 (probably an intentional alliteration with the eleven other words beginning with פ), לִפְנֵינֵנו Prov. 16, 4, and בְּעֵרֵינוּ (so Baer, following the best authorities) Ezra 10, 14, rest only on the authority of the Masoretes, not of the authors. So also in הָאֱהָלִי Jos. 7, 21, הַחֲצִי Jos. 8, 33 (previously חֲצִי), הֶהְרֹחֲתִיהָ 2 Ki. 15, 16 (dittography of the ה), the article is simply to be omitted as syntactically impossible; the ו of הִדְבָּרִי Mic. 2, 12 is the copula belonging to the next word.

§ 128. *The Indication of the Genitive Relation by means of the Construct State.*

Cf. especially Philippi's work cited at the head of § 89.

- a* 1. The genitive relation is regularly expressed (see § 89) by the close connexion of the *nomen regens* (in the construct state) with the *nomen rectum* (in the genitive). Since only *one* *nomen regens* can be immediately connected with one *nomen rectum*, it follows that the same genitive cannot depend on two or more *co-ordinate* nouns, but a second (sometimes even a third, &c.) *regens* must be added with a suffix referring to the *nomen rectum*, e. g. בְּנֵי דָוִד וּבָנֹתָיו *the sons of David and his daughters* (not בְּנֵי וּבָנֹת דָּוִד); comp. 1 Ki. 8, 28¹. The language even prefers to avoid a series of several *co-ordinate** *genitives* depending upon one and the same *nomen regens* (such as occur in Gen. 14, 19. Num. 20, 5. 31, 54 [1 Chron. 13, 1]. Is. 22, 5. Ps. 8, 3), and rather tends to repeat the *nomen regens*, e. g. Gen. 24, 3 אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ *the God of heaven and the God of the earth* (so in Jer. 8, 1 the *regens* is five times repeated). A lengthened series of *genitives* may, however, be formed by a *nomen rectum* serving at the same time as *regens* to a *genitive* depending on it (comp. § 127. *a* [*d'*]); e. g. Gen. 47, 9 יְמֵי שְׁנֵי חַיֵּי אֲבֹתִי *the days of the years of the life of my fathers*; comp. Job 12, 24, where there are three *genitives*, Is. 10, 12 four, and 21, 17 five. As a rule,

¹ Very rare, and only possible in very rapid utterance, are such exceptions as Ezek. 31, 16 (סִבְחָר וְיִזְכָּר לְכָבוֹד); Prov. 16, 11.—In Is. 11, 2 *the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*, יִדְעָת, may at any rate also be taken as an absolute *genitive*, so also סִפְרָ Dan. 1, 4.

² In Ps. 114, 1 a second *genitive* is added even without the copula, but the parallelism of the members renders any misunderstanding impossible.

indeed, such an inconvenient accumulation of genitives is avoided by means of a circumlocution in the case of one of them (see § 129. d).

Rem. As the fundamental rules stated above are the necessary consequence not merely of *logical* but more especially of *rhythmical* relations (see § 89. a), we must feel the more hesitation in admitting the examples in which genitives are supposed to be loosely attached to forms other than the construct state. Some of these examples (the supposed genitives following a regens which is determined by the article) have been already discussed in § 127. f-h. Compare, moreover:

(a) Genitives after the absolute state, e. g. Is. 28, 1 *נַיִם שְׂמִינִים הָלֹמִי יֵין* *the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine*. The usual explanation, according to which *נַיִם שְׂמִינִים* forms *one* single idea (in German *Fettigkeitsthal*), on which the genitive *יֵין הָלֹמִי* then depends, in reality explains nothing; the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Jos. 3, 11 *הַבְּרִית* is a later addition; in Is. 32, 13 (*מִשׁוֹל*), and Ps. 68, 22 (*שִׁעוֹר*), the absolute for the construct state probably rests only on the authority of the Masoretes. In Jud. 6, 25 sqq. the text is obviously in confusion. In Jud. 8, 32 (cf. 6, 24) *בְּעֶפְרָה* should come either after *וַיִּבְרַךְ* or at the end of the verse; in Is. 63, 11 *מִשָּׁה* is probably a gloss on *יְמִיעוֹלִים* which has crept into the text; in 2 Sam. 4, 2 *לְאִישׁ בִּשְׁתָּה*, according to the LXX, has dropped out before *בָּן*; Ezek. 6, 11 is to be omitted with the LXX; if originally in the text, it could only be genitive (= *all abominations of evils*), not an adjective; Prov. 21, 6 the text is altogether uncertain (the LXX read *מִקִּשִׁי* for *מִקִּשִׁי*); in 1 Chron. 9, 13 the preposition *לְ* (after a *ל*) has dropped out before *מְלֹאכֶת* (comp. 12, 25).—Elsewhere (Deut. 3, 5. 1 Ki. 4, 13. 2 Chron. 8, 5) the supposed genitives are to be taken rather as words of nearer definition standing in apposition, i. e. *with high walls, gates and bars*. In Jer. 8, 5 *יְרוּשָׁלַם* is either in apposition to *הַעֵם הַזֶּה* or is better (since not in the LXX) omitted as a gloss.

(b) Genitives after a noun with a suffix (where the suffix prevents the direct government by the *nomen regens*). Thus in Lev. 27, 3. 5. 6, where *הַזָּכָר* after *עֶרְבֶךָ* might be taken, contrary to the accents, as subject of the following clause; however, from verses 13 and 23 (see above, § 127. i) it appears that the suffix in this word had entirely lost its meaning. In Lev. 6, 3 *כִּדּוֹ בָד* *his garment*, namely the garment of linen, unless simply in apposition, comp. § 131. d; Lev. 26, 42, where *בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב* could at most be explained as an elliptical form of expression for *בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב*, comp. § 125. h (probably, however, it is a case of dittography of the *י*, which was repeated also before *אֲבִרָהֶם*; so Valeton, *ZAW.* xii. 3); similarly, *בְּרִיתִי הַזֶּה* Jer. 33, 20, &c. On the other hand, *אִם יִהְיֶה נְבִיאָכֶם יְהוָה* Num. 12, 6 could not possibly mean *if your prophet be a prophet of the Lord*; the text is manifestly corrupt (probably *יִהְיֶה מִיְהוָה* is to be read, with Marti). In Ps. 55, 7 *בְּסִמְאֵי אֱלֹהִים* (usually explained as *thy divine throne*), *אֱלֹהִים* is most probably a later addition. In Jer. 52, 20 two readings are probably combined, *לְנֶחֱשֶׁתָם* without any addition, and *לְנֶחֱשֶׁת בְּלִי הַפְּלִים*.

(c) The interposition of a word is assumed between *כָּל־* (*the whole*; comp. § 127. b) and the genitive governed by it in 2 Sam. 1, 9. Job 27, 3 (*עוֹד*), and Hos. 14, 3 (*תִּשָּׂא*). In reality, however, in all three places the genitive

relation is destroyed by the transposition of the words (instead of *עוד כל*, &c.), and *כל* is rather to be taken adverbially (equivalent to *wholly*), e.g. 2 Sam. 1, 9 *because my life is yet wholly in me*, i.e. my whole life; comp. Philippi, *Stat. Constr.*, p. 10.—On the instances in which the original construct state *אין non-existence* is used without a following genitive, see the negative sentences, § 152. o.

- f* 2. The dependence of the *nomen rectum* on the *nomen regens* by no means represents merely what is, properly speaking, the genitive relation (see the examples under letters *g-i*). Very frequently the *nomen rectum* only adds a nearer definition of the *nomen regens*, whether by giving the name, the genus or species, the measure, the material, or finally an attribute of it (*genit. epexegeticus*, see the examples under letters *k-q*).

Examples. The *nomen rectum* represents—

- g* (a) A *subjective genitive*, specifying the possessor, author, &c., e.g. *בית־המלך* the king's house; *דבר יהוה* the word of the Lord.
- h* (b) An *objective genitive*, e.g. Obad. ver. 10 *מחטם אחיך* for the violence done to thy brother¹ (but in Ezek. 12, 19 *מחטם* is followed by a subjective genitive); Prov. 20, 2 *אימת מלך* the terror of a king; Gen. 18, 20 *ועשת סדם* the cry concerning Sodom; Is. 23, 5 *שמע צר* the report of (about) Tyre, comp. 2 Sam. 4, 4; Am. 8, 10 *אבל יחיד* the mourning for an only son; Deut. 20, 14 *שלל איביך* *praeda hostibus tuis erepta*; comp. Is. 3, 14. In a wider sense this includes such examples as *דרך עץ החיים* the way of (i.e. to) the tree of life, Gen. 3, 24; comp. Prov. 7, 27. Job 38, 20; *דרך הים* the way of (by) the sea, Is. 8, 23; *זבחי* *אליהם* the sacrifices of (i.e. pleasing to) God, Ps. 51, 19; *שבועת יהוה* the oath of (i.e. sworn before) the Lord, 1 Ki. 2, 43.
- i* (c) A *partitive genitive*; this includes especially the cases in which an adjective in the construct state is followed by a general term, e.g. *חכמות שריותיה* the wisest of her ladies, Jud. 5, 29; comp. for this way of expressing the superlative, § 133. *h*, and also letter *r* below.
- k* Merely formal genitives (*genit. explicativus* or *epexegeticus*) are those added to the construct state as nearer definitions—
- (d) Of the *name*, e.g. *נהר פרת* the river Euphrates; *ארץ כנען* the land of Canaan; *בתולת ישראל* the virgin Israel (not of Israel), Am. 5, 2.
- l* (e) Of the *genus*, e.g. Prov. 15, 20 (21, 20) *בסיל אדם* a fool of a man (= a foolish man); comp. Gen. 16, 12. Is. 29, 19. Mic. 5, 4, &c.
- m* (f) Of the *species*, e.g. *אנשי התרים* men of (the class of) merchants, 1 Ki. 10, 15; *אחוזת קבר* a possession of a burying-place, i.e. hereditary sepulchre, Gen. 23, 4, and elsewhere; *תאני הפירות* figs of (the class of) first ripe ones, Jer. 24, 2.

¹ Comp. in Latin a similar use of the genitive after *iniuria* (Caes. B. G. 1, 30), *metus* (*hostium*, Pompeii, &c.), *spes*, and other. In Greek, comp. *εβουλα τῶν φίλων*, *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ*, *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, 1 Cor. 1, 18.

(g) Of the *measure, weight, extent, number*, e.g. מַיִם מִסֹּפֶר *people of number*, *n* i. e. *few in number*, Gen. 34, 30. Deut. 26, 5; comp. also Ezek. 47, 3-5 *waters of the ankles, waters of the loins, waters of swimming*, i. e. which reached up to the ankles, or loins, or necessitated swimming; but in verse 4 in apposition מַיִם בְּרַפְּיָם.

(h) Of the *material*¹ of which something consists, e.g. כֵּלִי חֶרֶשׁ *a vessel of earthen-ware*, Num. 5, 17; כֵּסֵף *vessels of silver* (comp. the French *des vases d'or*); עֵץ אֲרוֹן *an ark of wood*, שֵׁבֶט בַּרְזֶל *a rod of iron*, Ps. 2, 9; comp. Gen. 3, 21. 6, 14. Jud. 7, 13, &c.

(i) Of the *attribute* of a person or thing, e.g. Gen. 17, 8 אֶחָדָה עֹלָם *an everlasting possession*; Prov. 17, 8 *a precious stone*; comp. Num. 28, 6. Is. 13, 8. 28, 4. Ps. 23, 2. 31, 3. Prov. 5, 19. 14, 5. Job 41, 19, and the examples of the genitive with a suffix given in § 135. *n*. Such a periphrasis for the expression of attributes frequently occurs, even when the corresponding adjectives are in use. Thus especially קֹדֶשׁ *holiness* very frequently serves as a periphrasis for the adjective קָדוֹשׁ (e.g. בְּגָדֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ *the holy garments*, Ex. 29, 29), since קָדוֹשׁ is used almost exclusively in reference to persons (hence also with עַם and גּוֹי *people*, and with שֵׁם *the name of a person*); the only exceptions are מְקוֹם קָדוֹשׁ *holy place*, Ex. 29, 31, and elsewhere; מַיִם קְדוֹשִׁים *holy water*, Num. 5, 17; קָדוֹשׁ as the predicate of יוֹם *day*, Neh. 8, 10 sq., and of מַחֲנֶה *camp*, Deut. 23, 15. So also the use of צַדִּיק *righteous* is always confined to persons, except in Deut. 4, 8; elsewhere the periphrasis with צָדֵק or צִדְקָה is always used, e.g. מֵאֻנֵּי צָדֵק *just balances*, Lev. 19, 36.

In a wider sense this use of the genitive also includes statements of the purpose for which something is intended, e.g. צֶאֱן מִבְּחָרָה *sheep for the slaughter*, Ps. 44, 23; מוֹסֵר שְׁלוֹמִנוּ *the chastisement designed for our peace*, Is. 53, 5; comp. 51, 17 (*the cup which causes staggering*). Ps. 116, 13; finally, also, the description of the material, with which something is laden or filled, e.g. 1 Sam. 16, 20 וְנָאֵר יַיִן וְחֶמֶר לֶחֶם *an ass laden with bread and a bottle of wine* (but probably עֵשְׂרָה is to be read for חֶמֶר); comp. Gen. 21, 14. Prov. 7, 20, and elsewhere.

Rem. 1. Certain substantives are used to convey an attributive idea in the construct state before a partitive genitive; thus מִבְּחָר *choice, selection*, as in Gen. 23, 6 קְבָרֵינוּ מִבְּחָר *the choice of our sepulchres*, i. e. *our choicest sepulchres*; Ex. 15, 4. Is. 22, 7. 37, 24; other examples are, Is. 1, 16 הַרְעָה לְעוֹלָם *the evil of your doings*, emphatically for *your evil doings*; Is. 17, 4. 37, 24 (= *the tall cedars thereof*). Ps. 139, 22.—This is the more common construction with the substantive כָּל *entirety*, for *all, the whole, every*, see § 127. *b*; it is also frequent with מְעַט *a little*, for *few*, 1 Sam. 17, 28, &c.

2. To the periphrases expressing attributive ideas (see letter *p* above) by means of a genitive construction, may be added the very numerous combination of the construct states אִישׁ *a man*, בָּעַל *master, possessor*, בֶּן *son*, and their feminines

¹ In the almost entire absence of corresponding adjectives (אֲרָז *made of cedar*, a denominative from אָרָז, and נְחֹשֶׁת *brass* are the only examples), the language regularly has recourse to the above periphrasis. On the form *qāṭūl*, as expressing an inherent property, comp. § 50. *f*; comp. also the proper name, בְּרִזְלִי *ferreus*.

and plurals (including מְחִי *men*, used only in the plural), with some appellative noun, in order to represent a person (poetically even a thing) as possessing some object or quality, or being in some condition. In English, such combinations are sometimes rendered by single substantives, sometimes by circumlocution.

Examples:—

- † (a) Of אִישׁ, &c.: אִישׁ דְּבָרִים *an eloquent man*, Ex. 4, 10 (but אִישׁ שֹׁפְחִים Job 11, 2 *a man of lips*, i.e. *a boaster*); אִישׁ לָשׁוֹן = *a slanderer*, Ps. 140, 12; אִישׁ דַּעַת *a man of knowledge*, Prov. 24, 5; אִישׁ חֶמָה *a wrathful man*, Prov. 15, 18; אִישׁ דָּמִים *a man of blood*, 2 Sam. 16, 7. Ps. 5, 7; comp. further, 1 Sam. 16, 18. 1 Ki. 2, 26. Is. 53, 3. Prov. 19, 6. 26, 21. 29, 1. Ezra 8, 18; also אִשְׁתׁ אִישׁ *a contentious woman*, Prov. 27, 15; in the plural, e.g. Gen. 6, 4 אֲנָשִׁי הַשָּׁמַיִם *the men of renown, famous*; comp. Gen. 47, 6. Is. 41, 11. Job 34, 8. 10 אֲנָשִׁי לִבָּב (אֲנָשִׁי לִבָּב *men of understanding*); with מְחִי, e.g. Is. 5, 13 מְחִי רָעָב *famished men*; Job 11, 11.
- 16 (b) Of בָּעַל, &c.: בָּעַל שֵׁנָה *hairy*, 2 Ki. 1, 8; בָּעַל הַחֲלֹמֹת *the dreamer*, Gen. 37, 19; comp. Nah. 1, 7. Prov. 1, 17. 18, 9 (*a destroyer*). 22, 24. 23, 2 (*disposed to eat, greedy*). 24, 8; feminine בָּעֻלַת־אֹב *a woman that hath a soothsaying spirit*, 1 Sam. 28, 7; comp. Nah. 3, 4; in the plural, e.g. בָּעֲלֵי חֲצִים *archers*, בָּעֲלֵי בְרִית *confederates*, Gen. 14, 13; בָּעֲלֵי שְׁבוּעָה *sworn supporters*, Neh. 6, 18.
- 17 (c) Of בֶּן־, &c.: בֶּן־חַיִל *a hero, warrior*; בֶּן־מִשְׁקָן *heir*, Gen. 15, 2; בֶּן־שָׁנָה *yearling*, Ex. 12, 5, and elsewhere; בֶּן־מֵאָת שָׁנָה *centum annos natus*, Gen. 21, 5; בֶּן־מָוֶת *worthy to die*, 1 Sam. 20, 31 (Luther, 2 Sam. 12, 5 *ein Kind des Todes*); comp. Deut. 25, 2 בֶּן־הַפֹּת *worthy to be beaten*; feminine, e.g. בַּת־בָּלִיעַל *a wicked woman*, 1 Sam. 1, 16; frequently also אִישׁ בָּלִיעַל, בְּנֵי ב', אֲנָשֵׁי ב', and even simply בָּלִיעַל, like the Latin *scelus* for *sceltestissimus*, 2 Sam. 23, 6. Job 34, 18; plural masculine, e.g. בְּנֵי־קֶרֶם *children of the east, orientals*; בְּנֵי מֶרֶד *children of rebellion*, Num. 17, 25. בֶּן־ is used poetically of things without life, e.g. Is. 5, 1 בֶּן־שֶׁקֶן *a fat*, i.e. *a fruitful (hill)*; Jon. 4, 10 בֶּן־לַיְלָה i.e. *grown in a night*; Job 41, 20 בֶּן־קֶוֶן *son of the bow* (i.e. *an arrow*); so also בְּנֵי רֶשֶׁף = *sparks*, Job 5, 7; Lam. 3, 13; בָּנוֹת Eccles. 12, 4 *the daughters of song*, probably meaning the individual notes.
- 20 3. Special mention must be made of the not infrequent idiom by which adjectives (sometimes also ordinals, see § 134. o) are added in the genitive, as substantives, rather than as attributes in the same state, gender, and number as the noun which they qualify; thus, Is. 28, 4 צִיָּה נֹבֵל *the flower of that which fades*, for which verse 1 has צִיָּה נֹבֵל *the fading flower*; comp. further, Is. 22, 24. Jer. 22, 17 (?). 52, 13. Ps. 73, 10. 74, 15. 78, 49; also the use of רַע as a substantive, e.g. in Prov. 2, 14 b. 6, 24 אִשְׁתׁ רַע and elsewhere, analogous to the New Testament phrase *ὁ δολοφύων ῥῆς ἀδικίας*, Luke 16, 8, and the French *un homme de bien*¹.—Finally, an adverb (treated as a substantive) may likewise be used as

¹ On the other hand, in such passages as Is. 36, 2 (2 Ki. 18, 17). Zech. 14, 4. Eccles. 8, 10, and others, there is no apparent reason why the Masora requires the construct state instead of the absolute; hence חַיִל Is. 36, 2 and גֵּיחַ Zech. 14, 4 must be intended as forms of the absolute state, shortened in consequence of their close connexion.

an exegetical genitive; comp. דָּמַי הַנֶּחֱם *blood shed without cause*, 1 Ki. 2, 31; Prov. 24, 28. 26, 2; Ezek. 30, 16 (דָּמַי).

3. The exegetical genitives include finally the numerous nearer *x* definitions which follow the construct state of adjectives (and of active and passive participles, or verbal adjectives, comp. § 116. *f-l*). For, while the word of nearer definition is added to the verb in the accusative (e. g. הָלַךְ אֶת־רַגְלָיו *he was diseased in his feet*, 1 Ki. 15, 23), it may, with participles and verbal adjectives, be either in the accusative (§ 116. *f* and *k*) or in the genitive, the case of a word depending on a noun. Such a genitive relation is usually termed an *improper annexion*. The nearer definition contains a statement either of the *material*, e. g. Ex. 3, 8, &c. אֶרֶץ זָבַח חֶלֶב וְדָבַשׁ *a land flowing with milk and honey*; or of the *means*, e. g. חָלַל־יָחֶדֶב *slain with the sword*, Is. 22, 2; or the *cause*, Cant. 2, 5 *sick of love*; or of the *scope of the attribute*¹, e. g. Gen. 39, 6 יָסַד־תֹּאֵר *fair of form*; cf. Gen. 41, 2. 4. Ex. 34, 6. 1 Sam. 16, 12. Jer. 32, 19. Nah. 1, 3. Ps. 119, 1. Job 37, 16; or of the *manner*, e. g. Ps. 59, 6 בְּגֵרֵי אֱמֶן *faithless ones of wickedness* (wickedly faithless).

Especially frequent is the use of this genitive to name the part *y* of the body described as being affected by some physical or mental condition, e. g. Ps. 24, 4 נְקִי כַפַּיִם *clean as regards hands*, &c.; 2 Sam. 9, 3. Is. 6, 5. Job 17, 9; Is. 19, 10 אֲנִי־נִפְשָׁא *grieved in soul*; 1 Sam. 1, 10. Job 3, 20. Also such examples as Amos 2, 16. Prov. 19, 1, where a suffix is attached to the substantive, must be regarded as instances of the genitive construction, on the analogy of Prov. 14, 2, see § 116. *k*.

§ 120. Expression of the Genitive by Circumlocution.

Besides the construction of a nomen rectum dependent upon *a* a nomen regens in the construct state (§§ 89 and 128), the connexion of two nouns may also be effected otherwise, either by simply attaching the dependent noun by means of the preposition לְ, which, according to § 119. *r*, expresses, besides other ideas, also that of *belonging to*², or by the addition of a relative clause (לְ מִשְׁפָּחָא, see letter *k* below).

¹ Comp. the Latin *integer vitæ scelerisque purus; tristes animi*, &c.

² Comp. the σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον in Greek, e. g. ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ for τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 88).—The Arab grammarians distinguish

- b* 1. The introduction of a genitive by ל sometimes occurs even when the construction with the construct state would be equally possible, e.g. 1 Sam. 14, 16 $\text{הַצִּיּוֹנִים לְשָׂאוֹל}$ *the watchmen of Saul*; Ps. 37, 16. 2 Chron. 28, 18 (where indeed the circumlocution makes the sense much plainer); as a rule, however, this use is restricted to the following cases:—
- c* (a) To prevent a nomen regens being determined by a following determinate genitive, e.g. 1 Sam. 16, 18 בֶּן יִשְׁעִי *a son of Jesse* (בֶּן יִשְׁעִי would be, according to § 127. a, *the son of Jesse*); comp. Gen. 14, 18. 36, 12. 41, 12. Num. 16, 22 (27, 16). 1 Sam. 17, 8. 2 Sam. 19, 21. 1 Ki. 2, 39 *two servants of Shimei*; Ps. 122, 5. Hence, regularly מְנוּחֵי דָוִד (Ps. 3, 1, &c.) *a psalm of David* (properly belonging to David as the author), for which לְדָוִד of *David* is used alone elliptically in Ps. 11, 1. 14, 1 and elsewhere. Such a case as לְדָוִד מְנוּחֵי (Ps. 24, 1 and elsewhere) is not to be regarded as a transposition, but מְנוּחֵי is used epexegetically for the general term omitted before לְדָוִד (as it were, *a poem of David, a psalm*). Moreover, the introduction of the author, poet, &c., by this *Lamed auctoris* is the customary idiom also in the other Semitic dialects, especially in Arabic.
- d* (b) When a genitive is to be made dependent on a nomen regens, which is itself composed of a nomen regens and rectum, and represents, as a compound, one united idea, e.g. $\text{חֶלֶקֶת הַשָּׂדֶה לְבֹאֵז}$ *the portion of field belonging to Boaz* (it would be *the portion of the field of Boaz*); 2 Ki. 5, 9 *at the house-door of Elisha*. This especially applies to the cases in which the compound regens represents a term in very common use, the fixed form of which cannot be altered, e.g. 1 Ki. 14, 19 $\text{עַל-סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַמֶּלֶכִּים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$ *in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel*; 15, 23 and elsewhere; comp. also Jos. 19, 51.
- e* (c) When for any reason the construction with the nomen regens in the construct state is impossible; comp. e.g. Lev. 18, 20, where שְׂכֵבְתָּהּ , on account of the suffix, cannot be used in the construct state; but Lev. 15, 16 sqq. and elsewhere, שְׂכֵבְתֶּיהֶן ; Jud. 3, 28 *the Jordan fords of Moab* (יַרְדֵּן) as a proper name cannot be used in the construct state); Ex. 20, 5 *upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me*; וְעַל-רִבְעִים must be kept in the absolute state for the sake of conformity with עַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים , and for the same reason also $\text{לְאַלְפִים לְאַהֲבִי}$.
- f* (d) After statements of number in such cases as Gen. 8, 14 $\text{בְּשֶׁבַע וְעֶשְׂרִים יוֹם}$ *on the seven and twentieth day of the month*; comp. 7, 11. 16, 3 and frequently, or as in Hag. 1, 1 $\text{בְּשָׁנָה שְׁתַּיִם לְדָרְיוֹשׁ}$ *in the second year of Darius*; the numeral here is always one compound idea with the substantive numbered, and consequently (as in the examples under letter *b*) does not admit of being in the constr. st. with a genitive. The same naturally applies also to such examples as 1 Ki. 3, 18 $\text{בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לְלִדְתִּי}$ *on the third day of my giving birth* (i.e. after my giving birth). Comp. also the standing phrase בְּאַחַד לַחֹדֶשׁ *on the first (day) of the month*, Gen. 8, 5 and frequently.

a twofold genitive, one of which may be resolved by ל , and the other by מִן , [see Wright's *Arabic Grammar*, vol. ii. § 75 sqq.—G.W.C.] The *de* of the Romance languages is a development of the latter idea; the Gascon, however, says e.g. *la fille à Mr. N.*, laying stress upon the idea of *belonging to* and not that of *origin*, as in *la fille de . . .* of the literary language.

Rem. In cases like 2 Sam. 3, 2 *and his firstborn was Amnon* לְאַחִיעֶזֶר of *g* *Ahinoam*, the genitive expressed by circumlocution with לְ is in reality dependent on a regens which is omitted (בֶּן לְאַחִיעֶזֶר *a son of Ahinoam*); comp. 2 Sam. 3, 3. 5. 1 Ki. 14, 13. Am. 5, 3, and the remarks on מְזֻמָּר in letter *c* above.

2. The periphrastic expression of the genitive by means of לְ אִשֶּׁר is used ^h principally to state the *possessor*, e.g. Gen. 29, 9 הֵצֵאן אִשֶּׁר לְאָבִיהָ *her father's sheep* (prop. *the sheep which belonged to her father*); Gen. 47, 4 and frequently. So also (according to § 128. *a*) when a genitive depends on more than one substantive, e.g. Gen. 40, 5 *the butler and the baker who* (belonged) *to the king of Egypt* וְאִפְסָה מִלֶּךְ מִצְרַיִם would indicate only the baker as belonging to the king; or when a genitive (as in the examples in letter *d* above) is added to a compound, which expresses one united idea (Ruth 4, 3); or when, as a fixed term (e.g. a title), it appears always in the same form, e.g. Cant. 1, 1 שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים שִׁיר אִשֶּׁר לְשִׁלְמֹה *the Song of songs, of Solomon*; 1 Sam. 21, 8. 2 Sam. 2, 8. 1 Chron. 11, 10; comp. also Gen. 41, 43¹.

§ 130. *Wider Use of the Construct State.*

The construct state, which, according to § 89. *a*, primarily represents *a* only the immediate government by one substantive of the following word (or combination of words), is frequently employed in rapid narrative as a connecting form, even apart from the genitive relation; so especially—

(1) Before prepositions, particularly in more elevated (prophetic or poetic) style, especially when the nomen regens is a participle. Thus before בְּ, שִׂמְחַת בְּבָצִיר *the joy in the harvest*, Is. 9, 2. 2 Sam. 1, 21. Ps. 136, 8 sq.; in participles, Is. 5, 11. 9, 1. 19, 8. Ps. 84, 7, and especially often when בְּ with a suffix follows the participle, e.g. Ps. 2, 12 בּוֹ בְּלִחוּסֵי; comp. Nah. 1, 7. Jer. 8, 16 (Ps. 24, 1); Ps. 64, 9 (unless רָצָה should be read); 98, 7².—Before לְ, Hos. 9, 6. Ps. 58, 5 (before לְטֹ); Prov. 24, 9. Lam. 2, 18 (before לְךָ); 1 Chron. 6, 55. 23, 28; in participles, Ezek. 38, 11. Job 18, 2. 24, 5; before לְ with an infinitive, Is. 56, 10, and again before לְ with a suffix, Gen. 24, 21.

¹ In New Hebrew שֶׁל (derived from שֶׁל = אִשֶּׁר לְ, see § 36, and comp. Cant. 1, 6. 3, 7 שֶׁלִּי, שֶׁלִּשְׁלֹמֹה) is used like the simple relative ׀, ׀ in Aramaic, as an independent sign of the genitive.

² In Jud. 8, 11 the article is even used before a construct state followed by בְּ, in order to determine the whole combination בְּנֵי בְּאֵהָלִים שְׂכֵנֵיהֶם *tent-dwellers*, taken as one word; comp., however, the remarks in § 127. *f-i*, on similar grammatical solecisms.

- Is. 30, 18. 64, 3¹; — before אֶל, Is. 14, 19. Ezek. 21, 17; — before אִתּוֹ (*with*), Is. 8, 6; — before כִּי, Gen. 3, 22. Is. 28, 9 (a participle); Jer. 23, 23. Ezek. 13, 2. Hos. 7, 5; — before עַל, Jud. 5, 10; before בְּלִי, Is. 14, 6; before the *nota accus.* אֶת, Jer. 33, 22; before a locative (which in such cases also serves as a genitive), Ex. 27, 13. Jer. 1, 15.
- b (2) Before *wāw copulative*, e.g. Ezek. 26, 10; but הִכְמַת Is. 33, 6, בִּלְתִּי 35, 2, and שָׁכַרְתָּ 51, 21 may be cases of an intentional reversion to the old feminine ending *ath*, in order to avoid the hiatus (!) הִכְמַת.
- c (3) When it governs the (originally demonstrative) pronoun אֵשֶׁר; so especially in the combination אֵשֶׁר מְקוֹם אֵשֶׁר *the place where* (prop. of *that which*) . . . , Gen. 39, 20. 40, 3; or בְּמִקְוֹם אֵשֶׁר Lev. 4, 24. 33. 2 Sam. 15, 21. 1 Ki. 21, 19. Jer. 22, 12. Ezek. 21, 35. Hos. 2, 1. We should expect אֵשֶׁר הַמְקוֹם אֵשֶׁר, בְּמִקְוֹם אֵשֶׁר, as in Gen. 35, 13 &c., *at the place which* . . . , cf. § 138; אֵשֶׁר is treated as a *nomen rectum* instead of as an attribute. Cf. also מִיּוֹם אֵשֶׁר followed by a *perfect* in 1 Sam. 29, 8, and מִיּוֹם אֵשֶׁר Lev. 13, 46. Num. 9, 18; also דְּבַר מַה־יֵּרָאֵנִי (the matter of that *which*, i.e.) *whatsoever he sheweth me*, Num. 23, 3².
- d (4) When it governs independent sentences (cf. § 155), which virtually stand to the construct state (as *nomen regens*) in the genitive relation, e.g. Ex. 4, 13 בְּיַד־שִׁלְחָה prop. *by the hand of* him whom *thou wilt send*; Is. 29, 1 חָנָה דָּוִד קִרְיָתָהּ the city where David encamped; Jer. 48, 36. Ps. 16, 3 (if the text be right). 65, 5 (Prov. 8, 32). Ps. 81, 6. Job 18, 21 the place of him that knoweth not God; Job 29, 16. Lam. 1, 14 (if the text be right) into the hands of those against whom I cannot &c.³ In Gen. 39, 4 (בְּלִי־שִׁלּוֹ) the בְּלִי takes after it a noun-clause, and

¹ These are to be distinguished from the cases where ל follows a construct state, which in conjunction with כִּי (and the following ל) has become a sort of preposition or adverb of place; thus, we have מִבֵּית־לְ Ex. 26, 33 (for which in Ezek. 1, 27 merely לִּבֵּית meaning simply *within*; לִּי מִיְמִין (2 Ki. 23, 13. Ezek. 10, 3) *on the right hand* (i.e. south) of; לִּי מִצְפּוֹן (Jos. 8, 11. 13. Jud. 2, 9) *on the north of*; comp. also Jos. 15, 21 and לִפְנֵי מֶן Neh. 13, 4.

² In Deut. 23, 5 the construct state governs a sentence introduced by the conjunction אֵשֶׁר עַל־דְּבַר אֵשֶׁר (*by reason of the fact that*, i.e. *because*); so also in 1 Sam. 3, 13.

³ Probably Gen. 22, 14 is also to be so explained (contrary to the accents), and certainly (contrary to the very unnatural division of the verses) 2 Chron. 30, 18, which should read on thus: יְהוָה הַטּוֹב יְכַפֵּר וְעַד כָּל־לִבּוֹ הִקְבֹּה הָקִי the good Lord pardon every one that setteth his heart to seek God. [See Wickes' *Accentuation of the Twenty-one Prose Books of the Old Testament*, p. 140.—G. W. C.]

in Ex. 9, 4, still more boldly, a subst. with לְ.—Very often a *time-determination* governs the following sentence in this way; thus, אֲחֵרֵי followed by a perfect, 1 Sam. 5, 9; בָּיּוֹם Ps. 102, 3 (before a noun-clause). Ex. 6, 28. Num. 3, 1. Deut. 4, 15. 2 Sam. 22, 1. Ps. 18, 1. 59, 17. 138, 3 (in every case before a following perfect). Ps. 56, 10 (before an imperfect); מִיּוֹם followed by the perfect, Jer. 36, 2; בְּלַיְלָהּ Lev. 14, 46. 1 Sam. 25, 15. Job 29, 2 (מִיָּמֵי as in the days when . . .; comp. בְּיָמֹת and שָׁנֹת before a perfect, Ps. 90, 15); בְּעֵת before a perfect, Jer. 6, 15 (cf. 49, 8. 50, 31); before an imperfect, Job 6, 17; הִנֵּחֶלֶת before a perfect, Hos. 1, 2.

(5) Connected with a following word in apposition; certainly *e* so in such cases as בְּתוּלַת בְּתֻצִיָּן the virgin, the daughter of Zion, Is. 37, 22; comp. 23, 12. Jer. 14, 17; also 1 Sam. 28, 7 אִשָּׁת בְּעֵלְתָּאֵב a woman, possessor of a soothsaying spirit; comp. Deut. 21, 11.—Gen. 14, 10. Jud. 19, 22. 2 Ki. 10, 6. 17, 13 *Q'ré*; Jer. 20, 15. 46, 9. Ps. 35, 16 (?). 78, 9. Job 20, 17 *δ* (unless נִחְלִי or נִחְרִי be a gloss); Dan. 11, 14.

Rem. Some of the above passages may also be explained by supposing that *f* there exists a real genitive relation towards the preceding construct state, which has been, as it were, provisionally left *in suspensio*, in consequence of the insertion of some interrupting word, e.g. Is. 37, 22, &c.; Job 20, 17 *a*. Elsewhere (Deut. 33, 19. Ps. 68, 34) the *nomen regens* probably governs the following construct state directly¹.

(6) The numeral אחד one for אֶחָד in close connexion, and even *g* with small distinctives, e.g. Gen. 48, 22. 2 Sam. 17, 22. Is. 27, 12. Zech. 11, 7.

The character of these passages shows that the numeral here cannot be in the construct state, but is merely a rhythmical shortening of the usual (tone-lengthened) form. Analogous to this are the apparent construct states שְׁנֵי, שְׁלֹשִׁי, &c., in the compound numerals from eleven to nineteen, see § 97. *d*.

§ 181. Apposition.

1. Apposition in the stricter sense is the collocation of two sub- *a* stantives in the same case in order to define more exactly (or to complete) the one by the other, and, as a rule (see, however, below, letter *g*), the former by the latter. Apposition in Hebrew (as in the

¹ So also Is. 28, 16 a corner stone of the preciousness (יְסֻדִּית is a substantive not an adjective) of a grounded foundation, i.e. a precious corner stone of surest foundation.—In 2 Sam. 20, 19 the text is wholly corrupt; in Ps. 119, 128 read בְּלִי פֶסֶדִיךָ.

other Semitic languages¹) is by no means confined to those cases in which it is used in English or in the classical languages. It is not infrequently found when either the *subordination* of one substantive to the other or some more circumstantial kind of exegetical addition would be expected.

2. The principal kinds of apposition of nouns in Hebrew are the following:—

- b (a) The collocation of *genus* and *species*, e.g. אִשָּׁה אַלְמָנָה *a woman (who was) a widow*, 1 Ki. 7, 14; נַעֲרָה בְּתוּלָה *a damsel (that is) a virgin*, Deut. 22, 23. 28. Jud. 21, 12. 1 Sam. 30, 17. 1 Ki. 1, 2; comp. Gen. 13, 8. 21, 20 (where, however, נָשִׁית is probably an explanatory gloss); Ex. 22, 30. 24, 5 (1 Sam. 11, 15). Lev. 6, 13. 1 Sam. 7, 9. 2 Sam. 15, 16. 1 Ki. 3, 16. 5, 29 (but probably מִכָּל should be read instead of מִכָּל); Is. 3, 24. Jer. 20, 1. No doubt also פֶּה הָרֹאשׁ *the priest (who is) the chief man*, 2 Ki. 25, 18, &c.—In 2 Sam. 10, 7 read הַגִּבּוֹר הַזֶּה with the LXX.
- c (b) Collocation of the *person* or *thing* and the *attribute*, e.g. Job 20, 29 (27, 13) וְהָ חֵלֶק אָדָם רָשָׁע *this is the portion of a man, (who is) a wicked man*; comp. Prov. 6, 12. — Prov. 22, 21 אֲמָרִים אֱמֶת *words (which are) truth*; comp. Ex. 30, 2. 1 Sam. 2, 13. Mic. 1, 11 (where, however, בִּשְׁת is most probably a gloss on עֲרִיָּה); Zech. 1, 13 (= *comfortable words*); Ps. 45, 5 (?). 68, 17 (comp. verse 16). In a wider sense this includes also such cases as Ps. 60, 5 יַיִן תִּרְעָלָה *wine which is staggering* (intoxicating drink), which causes staggering²; 1 Ki. 22, 27 (Is. 30, 20) מַיִם לַחַץ *water which is affliction*, drunk in trouble (imprisonment). Still more boldly, 1 Ki. 5, 3 רְעִי בָקָר *oxen* which were taken out of the *pastures*, and 1 Ki. 6, 7 אֲבָנִים בְּלֹא שָׂרָב *undressed stones* which come from the *quarry*, probably a corruption of מִסְפָּע.

¹ On certain uses of apposition peculiar to the Semitic languages, comp. the exhaustive discussion by Fleischer, 'Ueber einige Arten der Nominalapposition im Arab.' (*Kleine Schriften*, ii. 16); [and see also Driver, *Tenses*, Appendix IV.]

² Unless it is to be translated *thou gavest us intoxication to drink as wine* (and so in 1 Ki. 22, 27 *give him affliction to eat as bread*, &c.); comp. Ps. 80, 6 and the analogous examples of apposition in the form of a second accusative in § 117. *kk*. Moreover, having regard to הַרְקָח יַיִן *spiced wine*, Cant. 8, 2, and עֵיז פֶּרָא *a wild ass's colt*, Job 11, 12 (in which passages יַיִן and עֵיז must certainly be in the construct state) we cannot but ask whether the Masora does not intend the יַיִן in Ps. 60, 5 to be taken as construct state (for which elsewhere יַיִן).

A person and a condition are in apposition in Ezek. 18, 6 (unless בְּנֵדָתָהּ is to be read).—In 1 Sam. 4, 1 read אֲנִי הָעֵץ, according to 5, 1. 7, 12.

(c) Collocation of the *person* (Deut. 28, 36) or *thing* (form) and *d material*¹, or of the *place* or *measure* and its *contents*, e.g. 1 Chron. 15, 19 חֲשֹׁת בְּמַצְלִיתִים with cymbals which were brass, i.e. of brass; Ezek. 22, 18, comp. Ex. 26, 25. Dan. 11, 8. 1 Chron. 28, 15. 18; Ex. 28, 17 four rows, namely stones (for which 39, 10 has מִיָּדֵי אֲבָתָן); comp. 2 Chron. 4, 13. Lev. 6, 3 (see, however, § 128. d); 2 Ki. 7, 1 סֶאֶה סֶלֶת a seah of fine flour; comp. 2 Ki. 7, 16. 18. Gen. 18, 6. Ex. 16, 33. Lev. 3, 11. Ruth 2, 17. 1 Ki. 16, 24. 2 Ki. 5, 23 כֶּסֶף כְּבָרִים two talents of silver²; comp. 5, 17. Ezek. 22, 18 (if the text be right). With the *material* placed before the *measure*, Ex. 30, 23 sq.—A *period of time* and its contents are placed in apposition in חֹדֶשׁ יָמִים a month of days, i.e. a month's time = for a whole month, Gen. 29, 14. Num. 11, 20. 21, comp. Deut. 21, 13. 2 Ki. 15, 13, and שְׁנֵתַיִם יָמִים two years' time, i.e. two full years, Gen. 41, 1. 2 Sam. 13, 23. 14, 28. 24, 13. Jer. 28, 3. 11. Dan. 10, 2 sq.

Finally, under this head may be included all the cases in which a numeral (regarded as a substantive) is followed by the object numbered in apposition, e.g. שְׁלֹשָׁה בָּנִים trias sc. filii, § 97. a and § 134. b.

(d) Collocation of the *thing* and the *measure* or *extent*, *number*, &c., e.g. Num. 9, 20 יָמִים מְסָפָר days, (a small) number, i.e. only a few days; גְּסָף מְשָׁנָה money, repetition, i.e. twice as much money, Gen. 43, 12; מַיִם בְּרִיָּים water which was of the measure of the knees, which reached to the knees, Ezek. 47, 4 (also מַיִם מִתְּנִיָּים water that was to the loins, in the same verse).—This likewise includes the cases in which a noun is followed in apposition by a numeral (see § 134. c) or an adverb, originally conceived as a substantive, e.g. נְהִי 2, 12 אֲנָשִׁים מְעַט men, a few, i.e. some few men; 1 Ki. 5, 9 הַבִּנְיָה הַרְבֵּה understanding, much-making, i.e. much understanding: comp. 2 Sam. 8, 8 and elsewhere.

(e) Collocation of the *thing* and its *name*, e.g. בְּהָרֵם שֵׁעִיר in their mountainous district, Seir (perhaps only a subsequent gloss), Gen. 14, 6;

¹ Comp. also the examples treated above in § 127. h.

² On the anomalous form כְּבָרִים (instead of כְּבָרִים; cf. כְּבָרִים immediately before), cf. § 88. b.

הָאָרֶץ בְּנֵנָה *the land Canaan*, Num. 34, 2; comp. Ezra 9, 1. 1 Chron. 5, 9 (see letter *g* below).—For examples of nouns in the construct state before a noun in apposition, see § 130. *e* above.

- § Rem. 1. Only in certain combinations does the noun of nearer definition come first, e.g. הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה *king David, king Solomon* (less frequently הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד &c. 2 Sam. 13, 39. 1 Ki. 2, 17. 12, 2. 2 Ki. 8, 29. 9, 15, &c.)
- h 2. When the *nota accusativi* (אֵת, אֶת) or a preposition precedes the first substantive, it *may* be repeated before the noun in apposition, e.g. Gen. 4, 2. 22, 2. 24, 4. 47, 29. Is. 66, 21; this usually occurs when the nearer definition precedes a *proper name*. As a rule, however, the repetition does not take place (Deut. 18, 1. Jer. 33, 18. 1 Sam. 2, 14). A noun in apposition is made determinate, even after a noun with a prefix, in the ordinary way, e.g. 2 Chron. 12, 13 בִּירוּשָׁלַם הָעִיר *in Jerusalem, the city which, &c.*¹
- i 3. Sometimes a second adjective is used in apposition to a preceding adjective, in order to modify in some way the meaning of the first, e.g. Lev. 13, 19 בְּהֶרֶת לְבָנָה אֲדָמָה *a white-reddish (light red) bright spot*.
- k 4. *Permutation* is to be regarded as a variety of apposition. It is not complementary like apposition proper (see letter *a* above), but rather *defines* the preceding substantive (or pronoun, see below), in order to prevent any possible misunderstanding. This includes cases like Gen. 9, 4 *with the life thereof* (which is) *the blood thereof*; Deut. 2, 26. 2 Ki. 3, 4 *an hundred thousand rams, the wool*, i. e. the wool of the rams; Jer. 25, 15 *this cup of the wine that is of fury* (but הַחֶמֶה is probably a gloss); Is. 42, 25 *he poured upon him fury*, namely *his anger*²; but especially the examples in which such a permutative is added to a preceding pronoun, viz.—
- l (a) To a separate pronoun, e.g. Ex. 7, 11; with regard to the vocative, comp. § 126. *f*.
- m (b) To an accusative suffix, e.g. Ex. 2, 6 *she saw him, the child* (unless אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד be a later gloss); Ex. 35, 5. Lev. 13, 59 *b*. 1 Ki. 19, 21 (where, indeed, הַיֶּשָׁר appears to be a late gloss); 21, 13. 2 Ki. 16, 15 *Kth*. Jer. 9, 14. 31, 2. Ezek. 3, 21. Prov. 13, 24 (comp., however, Delitzsch on the passage); Eccles. 2, 21 (according to Delitzsch rather a double accusative)³.
- n (c) To a noun-suffix, e.g. Ezek. 10, 3 בָּבֹאֵי הָאִישׁ *when he went in, the man*; 42, 14; comp. Prov. 13, 4 (!). Ezra 3, 12; so also after a preposition with suffix, e.g. Eccles. 4, 10 הָאִישׁ לֹא *woe to him, the one alone*; with a repetition

¹ In 1 Ki. 11, 8 participles after לְכָל־נָשָׁיו, as in 2 Ki. 10, 6 after אֶת־זִרְיָיו, הָעִיר, in 19, 2 after a determinate accusative, and in Hag. 1, 4 after בְּנִתְיָכֶם, are used *without* the article; these, however, are probably to be explained not as in apposition, but according to § 118. *f*.

² But מִים Gen. 6, 17 (comp. 7, 6) is to be regarded as a later gloss upon the archaic מַבּוּל.

³ For וְיִשְׁנֶה 1 Sam. 21, 14 either וְיִשְׁנֶה is to be read or the *Kth* *thb* is to be explained according to § 75. *b*, note. Also יִלְכְּדֶנּוּ Prov. 5, 22 has hardly preserved the correct form.

of the preposition, Num. 32, 33. Jos. 1, 2 לָהֶם לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *to them, to the children of Israel*; Jer. 51, 56. 2 Chron. 26, 14¹.—Comp., finally, Cant. 3, 7, where the suffix precedes the genitive periphrastically expressed by נָשָׁא (as in Ezra 9, 1, where the genitive is expressed by לִי)².

Of a different kind are the cases in which the permutative with its proper suffix follows as a kind of correction of the preceding suffix, e.g. Is. 29, 23 *when he* (or rather) *his children see*, &c. (but יִלְדָיו is clearly a gloss); comp. Ps. 83, 12, perhaps also Job 29, 3.

5. Cases of apposition in a *wider sense* are those in which the nearer definition added to the noun was originally regarded as an *adverbial accusative*; on its use with the verb and on the relative correctness of speaking of such an accusative in Hebrew, cf. § 118. *a* and *m*. Owing to the lack of case-endings, indeed, it is in many instances only by analogies elsewhere (especially in Arabic) that we can decide whether the case is one of apposition in the narrower or in the wider sense; in other instances this must remain quite uncertain. However, the following are probably cases of apposition in the wider sense:—

(a) Such phrases as כֶּסֶף כָּסֶפֶה *a double amount in money*, Gen. 43, 15; comp. 2 Sam. 21, 20. Jer. 17, 18; 1 Sam. 17, 5 *five thousand shekels in brass*; certainly such cases as Job 15, 10 *older than thy father in days*, and the expression of the superlative by means of מְאֹד (originally a substantive), e.g. מְאֹד טוֹב *very good*, Gen. 1, 31 (comp. also Eccles. 7, 16 צָדִיק הַרְבֵּה *righteous over much*), and the very frequent מְאֹד הַרְבֵּה prop. *a much-making exceedingly*, i.e. *exceedingly great*, Gen. 15, 1 and elsewhere, also Prov. 23, 29 פְּצָעִים חֲנָם *wounds without cause*³, perhaps also Gen. 34, 25 (בְּצִחָה).

(b) A few examples, in which an exegetical substantive is added to a substantive with a suffix; thus, Ezek. 16, 27 וְמִן הַדֶּרֶךְ וְהָאֵרֶץ *thy conduct in lewdness* (but it is also possible to explain this according to letter *c*, *of thy conduct*, which is *lewdness*); cf. Ezek. 24, 13. 2 Sam. 22, 33 מְעוֹזי חֵיל *my fortress in strength*, i.e. *my strong fortress* (comp., however, Ps. 18, 33); Hab. 3, 8. Ps. 71, 7. While even in these examples the deviation from the ordinary usage of the language (comp. § 135. *n*) is strange, it is much more so in חוֹב חֲבָלָתוֹ Ezek. 18, 7, i.e. according to the context *his pledge for a debt*; Ezra 2, 62 הַמִּתְחַשִּׁים *their register*, namely of those that were reckoned by genealogy (but perhaps הַמִּתְחִי is in apposition to the suffix in בְּתִכְבֶּם), also the curious combinations

¹ But in Is. 17, 6 we should certainly divide the words differently and read בְּסַעֲפֵי הַצִּיָּח, and in Prov. 14, 13 אַחֲרִית הַשְׂמִימָה; in Gen. 2, 19 נָשָׂא חַיָּה is a late gloss upon לָהּ.

² Some of the examples given above are textually (or exegetically) doubtful, whilst in the case of others, especially those from the later Books, we cannot help asking whether such a prolepsis of the genitive by means of a suffix (as e.g. Ezek. 10, 3) is not due to the influence of Aramaic, in which it is the customary idiom; comp. Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Biblisch-Aram.*, § 81. *e* and § 88.

³ In Ps. 69, 5 חֲנָם (like שָׁקֵר *in a false way, falsely*, Ps. 35, 19 and 38, 20) is used as an *adverbial accusative* with a participle; comp. § 118. *q*.

(mentioned in § 128. *d*) of בְּרִיתִי with a proper name (Lev. 26, 42), and in Jer. 33, 20 with הָיִים¹.

- 5 6. In Deut. 33, 4 (מִן־רֶשֶׁת), perhaps מִן־רֶשֶׁת is to be read), 33, 27 (מִן־עֵנָה), Jud. 7, 8 (עֵנָה), and Job 31, 11 (עֵנָה), the absolute state appears to be used instead of the construct to govern a following logical genitive; this, however, cannot be explained either as a special kind of apposition, or (with Hitzig) as a peculiarity of the dialect of Northern Palestine, but merely as a textual corruption.—On the other hand, the remarkable combination אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת Ps. 80, 8. 15 arises from the fact, that in Pss. 42–83 אֱלֹהִים has almost throughout been subsequently substituted by some redactor for the divine name יְהוָה; on יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת comp. § 125. *h*. In Ps. 59, 6. 80, 5. 20 and 84, 9 יְהוָה has been reinstated in the text before אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת².

7. Lastly, the nearer definition (qualification) of a noun may be effected by means of a preposition (either with a suffix or with an independent noun), but must then be distinguished from the cases in which the preposition is dependent on a verb or verbal idea, e.g. Gen. 3, 6 and she gave also עֹפָה לְאִשָּׁתָה unto her husband with her (= her husband who was with her); in Gen. 9, 16 (that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh) and other places, the qualification of the noun is itself also qualified.

§ 132. Connexion of the Substantive with the Adjective³.

- a 1. The adjective (like the participle used adjectivally), which serves as an *attribute* of a substantive, stands *after* the substantive, and agrees

¹ But in Num. 25, 12 שְׁלֹום may also be explained according to letter *c*, as really in apposition. Comp. on the whole question Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, 4th ed., p. 203, note 1.

² Without this assumption it would be inconceivable that יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת should not have been written; that the author of these Psalms regarded צְבָאוֹת already as an independent name of God (so Gesenius and Olshausen) is out of the question.

³ On the expression of attributive ideas by substantives, comp. above, § 127. *h*, and § 128. *o*, with the note; § 135. *n* and § 141. *c* (substantives for adjectives as predicates of noun-clauses) and § 152. *u* (periphrases for negative qualities). On the use of the feminine of adjectives (and participles) to express abstract ideas, see § 122. *g*. It remains to mention further the employment (mostly only in poetry) of certain epithets in place of the substantives to which the quality in question belongs; e.g. אֲבִיר *the strong one*, i.e. God; אֲבִיר *the strong one*, i.e. the bull (Jer. 8, 16, and elsewhere, the horse); קָלִי *swift* = the runner (of the horse, Is. 30, 16); לְבָנָה *alba*, i.e. luna; פְּרִיָּה (fructifera) a fruitful tree, Is. 17, 6 (so פֶּרֶת Gen. 49, 22); רֹכֵץ *a croucher*, i.e. a crouching beast of prey, Gen. 4, 7. Comp. also רָגִז (gravis, augustus) and נָשִׂיא (elatus!), i.e. a prince. This use of adjectives and participles for substantives is much more extensive in Arabic. In Greek and Latin poetical language comp. such examples as θύγη = the sea; merum for vinum, &c.

with it in *gender* and *number*, e.g. אִישׁ גָּדוֹל *a great man*, יָפָה, אִשָּׁה *a beautiful woman*. If the substantive is immediately connected with a genitive, the attribute follows the latter, since, according to § 89 and § 128. *a*, the construct state and the absolute state belonging to it are inseparably united, e.g. Est. 8, 15 זָהָב גְּדוּלָּה *a great crown of gold*.—On the attribute when attached to a *determinate* substantive, see above, § 126. *u*.

Rem. 1. Where an adjectival attribute appears to stand *before* its substantive b (according to the usual explanation, for the sake of special emphasis) the relation is really appositional in character; thus, Is. 10, 30 עֲנִיָּה עֲנִתוֹת *O thou poor one, Anathoth!* (but probably עֲנִיָּה *answer her*, is to be read); comp. 23, 12, 53, 11 (*a righteous man, my servant*; but in 28, 21 וְרַחֵם and נִכְרִיָּה are predicates preceding the substantives); Jer. 3, 6. 10sq. Ps. 18, 4 *him who is worthy to be praised will I call upon, the Lord*; 92, 12 (apposition after participles). But רַבִּים רַבּוֹת *many*, are sometimes placed, like numerals, before the substantive (Jer. 16, 16. Ps. 32, 10. 89, 51. Neh. 9, 28; in Ps. 145, 7 רַב is a *subst. regens*); an appositional relation can scarcely be intended in these instances.

2. In a few expressions (mostly poetic) the adjective appears not as an attribute c after the substantive, but in the construct state governing it; so in the singular, Ex. 15, 16 (unless גָּדֹל should be read); 1 Sam. 16, 7 (*the height of his stature*); in the plural, 1 Sam. 17, 40 חֲלָסִי אֲבָנִים *smooth ones of (among) stones*, i.e. *smooth stones*; Is. 35, 9. Ezek. 7, 24. Ps. 46, 5, and with a following collective instead of a plural, e.g. Is. 29, 19 אֲבִיּוֹנֵי אָדָם *the poor among men*, i.e. *poor men*; Jer. 49, 20. Zech. 11, 7; comp. in Latin *canum degeneres*. However, in almost all these cases the adjective which is made into a *regens* is strongly emphatic, and is frequently equivalent to a superlative (see below, § 133. *g*).

3. When *two* adjectives follow a feminine, sometimes only that standing next d to it takes the feminine termination, e.g. 1 Ki. 19, 11 וְרָחַם גְּדוּלָּה וְחֶסֶד וְחַיִּים; 1 Sam. 15, 9 (comp., however, on this passage § 75. *γ*); Jer. 20, 9. Ps. 63, 2. A similar dislike of the feminine form may also be observed in the case of verbal predicates referring to feminine subjects, comp. § 145. *p* and *t*.

When an attribute qualifies several substantives of different genders, it agrees with the masculine, as being the *prior gender* (cf. § 146. *d*), e.g. Neh. 9, 13 חֲקִים וְמוֹצֵת מַלְכִּים; Jer. 34, 9. Zech. 8, 5.

When *three* attributes follow a substantive, the first two may stand without a conjunction, and the last be attached by *wāw copulative*, comp. Zech. 1, 8.

4. After feminines plural ending in יָם (§ 87. *p*) the adjectival attribute (in accordance with the fundamental rule stated above, letter *a*) takes the ending *ות* e, e.g. Is. 10, 14 בָּיִצִים עָזְבוֹת *forsaken eggs*; Gen. 32, 16. For a strange exception see Jer. 29, 17 (differently in 24, 2).

5. With regard to *number* it is to be remarked that—

(*a*) Substantives in the *dual* are followed by adjectives (or participles) in the f plural, e.g. Ps. 18, 28 (Prov. 6, 17) עֵינַיִם רָמוֹת *haughty eyes*; Is. 35, 3. Job 4, 3 sq., comp. § 88. *a*.

(*b*) *Collective* ideas are not infrequently joined with the *plural* of the adjective g or participle (*constructio ad sensum*); thus, e.g. עָם = *men*, 1 Sam. 13, 15. Is. 9, 1;

בְּלִי-יִשְׂרָאֵל = *all the Israelites*, 1 Sam. 2, 14; גְּלוּת = *the exiles*, Jer. 28, 4; comp. also נַפְשֵׁי שְׁנַיִם *two souls*, Gen. 46, 27¹.

- h* (c) The *pluralis excellentiae* or *pluralis maiestatis* is joined, as a rule, to the singular of the attribute, e.g. Ps. 7, 10 אֱלֹהִים צָדִיק; 1 Ki. 19, 4. 16 (= Is. 37, 4. 17); Is. 19, 4; comp., however, חַיִּים אֱלֹהִים Deut. 5, 23. 1 Sam. 17, 26. 36. Jer. 10, 10. 23, 36, perhaps also Ex. 20, 3 אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים = *another god*, and Jos. 24, 19 אֱלֹהִים קִדְשִׁים (comp., however, above, § 124. *g-k*). On the other hand, 1 Sam. 4, 8 is to be explained as having been said by the Philistines, who supposed that the Israelites had several gods. On the connexion of אֱלֹהִים with a plural attribute, see § 145. *i*.

2. On the adjective (in the construct state) governing a following genitive, comp. § 128. *x*; for the participle in the same construction, see § 116. *f-l*.

§ 133. The Comparison of Adjectives. (*Periphrastic Expression of the Comparative and Superlative.*)

- a* 1. Hebrew possesses no special forms either for the comparative or superlative of the adjective³. In order to express a comparative, the person or thing which is to be represented as excelled in some particular quality is attached to the attributive word by the preposition מִן (מִ), e.g. 1 Sam. 9, 2 גְּבוּהָ מִכָּל-הָעָם higher than any of the people. The fundamental idea evidently is, *tall away from all the people* (beyond all the people); comp. Jud. 14, 18 מָה-מֶתוּק מִדְּבַשׁ וְמָה עוֹז מִאֲרִי מה מתוק מדבש ומה עז מארי *what is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?* Ezek.

¹ But it is impossible to take תַּמְיָחִים in Ezek. 46, 6 as an attribute of בָּקָר; probably it is a correction intended to harmonize the passage with Num. 28, 11, where *two* young bullocks are required.

² Comp. 1 Sam. 28, 13, where אֱלֹהִים (in the sense of a *spirit*) is followed by עֲלִים as a second accusative; conversely in 1 Sam. 19, 13. 16, a singular suffix refers back to הַרְפִּים household god (but not so in Gen. 31, 34), as in Ps. 46, 4 to the plural of amplification יָמִים *sea*. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether רַבָּה Ps. 78, 15 is to be regarded as an attribute of תְּהוֹמֹת and not rather as the adverb, *abundantly*.

³ There is in Arabic a special form of the adjective (the *elative*) for the comparative and superlative, which in Hebrew would have the form אֶקְטֵל. Instances of it, perhaps, are אֶכָּזֵב daring, cruel, אֶכְזִיב deceptive (of a brook drying up), and its opposite אֶתֵּן (contracted from *aitan*) constantly flowing, *perennis*. These forms are, however, used without any perceptible emphasis, and cannot be regarded as more than isolated relics of an elative formation which has become obsolete, much as the Latin comparative disappears in Italian, and still more so in French, and is supplanted by the circumlocution with *più*, *plus*.

28, 3. Amos 6, 2. Frequently an infinitive appears as the object of the comparison, e.g. Gen. 29, 19 *it is better that I give her to thee, than that I should give her, &c.*; Ex. 14, 12. Ps. 118, 8 sq.¹

Rem. 1. This use of מִן is also very common when the attributive idea is represented by an intransitive verb, e.g. 1 Sam. 10, 23 וַיִּנְבֶּה מִכָּל-הָעָם *and he was higher than any of the people*; Nah. 3, 8. Job 7, 6. Elsewhere, especially after transitive verbs, מִן rather represents (on its different senses see § 119. v-2) the idea of a *separation, distinction or superiority* of one person or thing from or over others². This is evident in such cases as מִן בָּחַר to choose something (to prefer it) before something else, e.g. Job 7, 15, comp. Deut. 14, 2 (also מִן יִתְרוֹן . . . יִתְרוֹן the excellence of . . . over . . ., Eccles. 2, 13); it is also seen in examples like Gen. 37, 3 וַיֵּשְׂרָאֵל אֶהָב אֶת-יִסְחָק מִכָּל-בָּנָיו *now Israel loved Joseph more than all his (other) children*; 29, 30. 1 Sam. 2, 29. Hos. 6, 6³.

2. A somewhat different idea underlies the use of מִן after adjectives, or c intransitive verbs possessing an attributive sense, when the thought to be expressed is that the quality is *too little or too much* in force for the attainment of a particular aim or object, e.g. Is. 7, 13 הַמַּעַם מִכֶּם *is it a small thing (i.e. too little) for you to . . . ?* Job 15, 11; after an intransitive verb, e.g. Gen. 32, 11 *I am too insignificant (קטנתי) for all the mercies (I am not worthy of . . .), &c.*; comp. also the expressions מִן כָּבֵד to be too heavy for one, Ex. 18, 18. Num. 11, 14. Ps. 38, 5; מִן קָשָׁה to be too hard for one, Deut. 1, 17; מִן מְעַט to be too few for something, Exod. 12, 4; מִן זָבֵר to be too strong for one, Ps. 65, 4; מִן עֲצִים to be too mighty for one, Gen. 26, 16; מִן רֹם to be too high for one, Ps. 61, 3; מִן צָר to be too narrow for one, Is. 49, 19; מִן קָצֵר to be too short for something, Is. 50, 2, and very frequently מִן נִפְלֵא to be too wonderful for one (and, consequently, inconceivable or unattainable), Gen. 18, 14. Deut. 17, 8. 30, 11. Jer. 37, 17. Prov. 30, 18.—This use is especially seen in the numerous instances in which the attribute is followed by מִן with an infinitive, e.g. 1 Ki. 8, 64 הַבְּרָזָה הַזֹּאת . . . מִן קָטַן מְהִבֵּל *too little to receive (to be able to receive) the burnt offering*, comp. Gen. 4, 13. 36, 7 *too great for them to dwell together*; after verbs, e.g. Ex. 12, 4. Is. 28, 20. Ps. 40, 6. Finally, cf. מִן לָכֵם, followed by the infinitive, *it is enough (prop. too much) for you to . . ., meaning ye have . . .*

¹ In Jud. 11, 25 the adjective is specially intensified by repetition, *art thou so much better than Balak?* It would also be possible, however, to translate *art thou really better . . . ?*

² Comp. the Latin ablative with the comparative; also the etymology of such words as *eximius, egregius*, and the Homeric *ἐκ πάντων μάλιστα*, Il. 4, 96; *ἐκ πάντων*, 18, 431.

³ On the other hand, the phrase מִן צָרָק expresses not a comparison, but only a relation existing between one person and another; thus, in Gen. 38, 26 וַיִּצְדֵּק מִן צָרָקָה *means, she is in the right as against me*; comp. Job 4, 17. 32, 2.—In Prov. 17, 12 *rather (to meet with so and so) than . . .* is expressed by וְאֶל- before the second member.

long enough, 1 Ki. 12, 28; cf. Ex. 9, 28 and Ezek. 44, 6 (מן followed by a substantive)¹.

d In all these instances מן expresses either the *removal* of a thing from a person, or the *severance* of the person from some aim or object; comp. also the expression לא יבצר מהם כל וגור nothing will be unattainable for them (prop. there shall not be cut off from them anything which, &c.), Gen. 11, 6. Job 42, 3.

e 3. The attributive idea, on which מן logically depends, must sometimes, in consequence of a pregnant use of the מן (see the analogous examples in § 119. ff), be supplied from the context, e.g. Is. 10, 10 וּפְסִילֵיהֶם מִירֹאשֵׁי יְרוּשָׁלַם whose graven images were more numerous than those at Jerusalem, &c.²; Mic. 7, 4 worse than a thorn hedge; Ps. 62, 10 lighter than a breath; Job 11, 17 clearer than the noonday; Eccles. 4, 17 better than, &c.

f 2. The correlative comparatives greater—less (older—younger) are expressed by the simple adjective with the article (the great, equivalent to the greater, &c.); Gen. 1, 16. 19, 31. 34. 27, 15. 29, 16. 18. 26.

g 3. To express the superlative it is also sufficient (see above, letter f) to make the adjective determinate, either by means of the article or a following partitive genitive (or suffix); in this case the article or genitive indicates that the attribute in question belongs especially to one or more definite individuals³; e.g. 1 Sam. 9, 21 הַצָּעִירָה the least; 16, 11 הַקָּטָן the little one, i.e. the youngest of eight sons; 17, 14 David was הַקָּטָן the youngest, and the three great, i.e. elder, &c.; Gen. 42, 13. 44, 2. Cant. 1, 8.—So also with a qualifying adjective, e.g. Gen. 9, 24 בְּנוֹ הַקָּטָן his youngest son; comp. Jos. 14, 15; also with a following genitive, 2 Chron. 21, 17 קָטָן בְּנֵי אָבִיו the youngest of his sons; Prov. 30, 24 the least upon the earth; with suffix, Mic. 7, 4 מוֹכֵחַם their good one, i.e. the best of them; Jon. 3, 5 מִגְדֹּלָם וְעַד קָטָנָם from the greatest of them even to the least of them; comp. the inverse order in Jer. 6, 13. 31, 34.

h Rem. 1. The above examples apply only to the most common relative attributes (great, small, good), and to expressions which by usage easily came to be recognized as periphrases for the superlative. Other adjectives, however, when followed by a partitive genitive, also acquire the sense of a superlative; this appears from the context, e.g. Deut. 33, 19 the most hidden treasures of the sand; Jud. 5, 29 the wisest amongst her ladies; Is. 19, 11. 23, 8 sq. 29, 19. Jer. 49, 20. Ezek. 28, 7.

¹ Comp. also 2 Ki. 4, 3, where the idea of doing something too little is paraphrased by the Hiph. הִמְעִיעַ = do not too little, sc. לִשְׁאֹל in borrowing empty vessels.

² On this *comparatio decurtata*, cf. the still bolder pregnant construction in Ps. 4, 8, מִשְׂעֵת מִשְׂעֵת greater gladness than at the time, &c.

³ Comp. also עֲלֵיָהּ the one above, i.e. the Most High.

Zech. 11, 7. Ps. 45, 13. Job 30, 6 (*in the most frightful of valleys*). 41, 22; probably also Ps. 35, 16. On this government by the adjective generally, cf. § 132. c.—Moreover, the combination of a substantive in the construct state with an adjective used substantivally (discussed in § 128. w) sometimes serves as a periphrasis for the superlative, e.g. Is. 22, 24 כְּלֵי הַקֶּטָן *all the smallest vessels*; Cant. 7, 10 בַּיִן הַטוֹב *like the best wine* (where indeed הַטוֹב בַּיִן may have been originally intended).

2. Other periphrases for the superlative are the use of a substantive in the construct state before the plural of the same word (which is naturally to be regarded as a partitive genitive; comp. our *book of books*), e.g. Ex. 26, 33 קֶרֶשׁ הַקְּדוּשִׁים *the most holy place*; שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים (Cant. 1, 1) *the most excellent song*; comp. Gen. 9, 25 (= *servus servorum*, *the lowest servant*); Num. 3, 32. Deut. 10, 17¹ (Ps. 136, 3); 1 Ki. 8, 27. Is. 34, 10 (comp. Gal. 1, 5. Rev. 22, 5); Jer. 3, 19. Ezek. 16, 7. 26, 7 (*king of kings*, of Nebuchadrezzar; comp. 1 Tim. 6, 15. Rev. 17, 14. 19, 16, and another kind of circumlocution in Ps. 95, 3; Eccles. 1, 12. Similarly in Jer. 6, 28 two participles are combined, and in Hos. 10, 15 two substantives in the singular. Finally, the same object is attained by connecting one substantive in the construct state with another of the same stem (שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן *a sabbath of solemn rest*, i.e. an obligatory day of rest, Ex. 31, 15, &c.) or of the same meaning (e.g. חֹשֶׁךְ אֲפָלָה *a thick darkness*, Ex. 10, 22).

3. The intensification of attributes by means of repetition belongs rather to rhetoric than to syntax, e.g. Eccles. 7, 24 עֹמֵק עֹמֵק *exceeding deep*; 1 Sam. 2, 3. Prov. 20, 14; the adjective is even used three times in Is. 6, 3.—Comp. the repetition of adverbs for the same purpose in Gen. 7, 19. Num. 14, 7 (מָאֵר מָאֵר *exceeding*, also מָאֵר מְאֹד Ex. 1, 7 and elsewhere); Ezek. 42, 15.—On the other hand, in Deut. 28, 43 the repetition expresses a continuous progress, i.e. *higher and higher ... lower and lower*; in Deut. 2, 27 (see § 123. e) and 16, 20 (*nothing but justice*) the constancy of the action. Comp. Ex. 23, 30 מְעֻמָּם מְעֻמָּם *very gradually*².

The repetition of substantives serves also as a periphrasis for the superlative in such cases as לְדֹר דֹּר (Ex. 3, 15) = *to the remotest generations*; comp. 17, 16. Jer. 6, 14. 8, 11 (*perfect peace*); Ezek. 21, 32 (עָדָה repeated three times)³; 35, 7. Nah. 1, 2. Sometimes the completeness of an action or condition is expressed by placing together two or even three substantives of the same stem and of similar sound, comp. Ezek. 6, 14 (33, 28sq. 35, 3); 32, 15. Nah. 2, 11. Zeph. 1, 15 (Job 30, 3. 38, 27).

¹ *God of gods, and Lord of lords*; just as the supreme god of the Babylonians is called *bēl bēli* (Tiele, *Compend. der Rel.-Gesch.*, p. 87).

² Adverbs of the same stem are connected in this way in Num. 6, 9. Is. 29, 5. 30, 13; of different stems in Is. 5, 26 and Joel 4, 4. In Num. 12, 2 the particles וְרַק appear to be placed together for a similar purpose, equivalent to *simply and solely*.

³ Different in kind from the thrice repeated exclamation of the same words in 2 Sam. 18, 33. Jer. 7, 4 and 22, 29, and the double exclamation in Jer. 4, 19 and Lam. 1, 16 (?).

§ 134. Syntax of the Numerals.

Cf. the exhaustive statistics collected by Sven Herner, *Syntax der Zahlwörter im A. T.*, Lund, 1893.

- a* 1. The numerals from 2 to 10, as being originally abstract substantives, may be connected with their substantives in three different ways. They may stand either—

(a) In the construct state *before* the substantive (the object numbered being consequently in the genitive), e.g. יָמֵי שְׁלֹשָׁה *a triad of days*, i.e. three days; שְׁנֵי הָאָנָשִׁים *the two men*; or

- b* (b) In the absolute state *before* it (the object numbered being in apposition, § 131. *d*), e.g. בָּנִים שְׁלֹשָׁה *a triad, viz. sons*, i.e. three sons; שְׁנֵי אָנָשִׁים *two men*; or

- c* (c) In the absolute state (likewise in apposition) *after* the object numbered, e.g. בָּנָה שְׁלֹשָׁה. So especially in long lists, since in these the substantives naturally come first, e.g. Gen. 32, 15. Num. 7, 17, 28, 19. Apart from such cases, the frequency of this order in the later Books is due to the fact that the character of the numeral tended more and more to become adjectival rather than substantival¹.

- d* Rem. In Lev. 24, 22 אָחִיר follows the construct state כְּשֵׁשֶׁם, but here as in Num. 15, 16 כְּשֵׁשֶׁם should be read. In Gen. 42, 19 אָחִיר is in apposition to a substantive with a suffix (= *one of you brethren*; but verse 33 *the one of you brethren*). In Num. 31, 28 אָחִיר precedes the substantive in the Aramaic manner (= *one each*).—For מֵאֵה שָׁנָה (Gen. 7, 17, &c.) we find regularly in the Priestly Code (except in Gen. 17, 17. 23, 1) מֵאֵה שָׁנֹת (Gen. 5, 3, &c.) *an hundred years*. On the connexion of abstract numerals with suffixes, as שְׁנֵיהֶם *their duality*, i.e. *they two*, Gen. 2, 25 and elsewhere (also with a strengthening separate pronoun, as שְׁנֵי אָנָשִׁים 1 Sam. 20, 42), comp. § 97. *i*.

- e* 2. The numerals from 2 to 10 take the object numbered in the plural², with very few exceptions, such as Ex. 16, 22 (where שְׁנֵי הָעֹמֶר

¹ From Herner's tables (op. cit., pp. 55–66) it appears, according to p. 68, that in the documents J, E, D of the Pentateuch, in Jos. 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Megilloth, and Job, the numeral never, or very rarely, stands *after* its noun; in Kings and Ezekiel it stands several times *after*; in the Priestly Code and Jos. 13–24 nearly always *after*; in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, nearly as often *after* as *before* the noun. In Ex. 28, 10 the Masora makes the numeral in the genitive follow the construct state of the substantive numbered; we should, however, read אָחִיר שְׁמוֹת הַשָּׁשִׁי; for the omission of the article before שְׁ, cf. § 126. *w*.

² On examples such as Gen. 46, 27 נַפְשֵׁי שְׁנֵי *two souls*, comp. § 132. *g* (collectives joined with the plural of the adjective).

= *the double of an omer*). 2 Ki. 22, 1. Ezek. 45, 1, comp. 2 Ki. 8, 17 and 25, 17 *Kth*. The numerals from 11 to 19 generally take the plural, but with certain substantives frequently used with numerals the singular is more common (see further, under letter *f*). The tens (from 20 to 90), when they precede, take the singular (in the accusative, comp. § 131. *p*) of certain nouns frequently used with numerals (אֶלֶף *a thousand*, אִישׁ, יוֹם, כֶּרֶם, נֶפֶשׁ, שֶׁקֶל—but only in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code), otherwise the plural, as בָּנִים, בָּנוֹת, עָרִים (but cf. also Jud. 11, 33), &c.; on the other hand, the plural is necessary when they follow the object numbered in apposition (e.g. אַמּוֹת עֶשְׂרִים *twenty cubits*, 2 Chron. 3, 3 sq.; with the exception of 2 Sam. 24, 24, only in late Books). After מֵאָה and אֶלֶף the substantive numbered may be used either in the singular or plural, see further, letter *g* below.

Rem. 1. After the numerals from 11 to 19 the singular is used, as a rule, with יוֹם *day*, שָׁנָה *year*, אִישׁ *man*, נֶפֶשׁ *soul* (person), שִׁבְטָם *tribe*, מַצֵּבָה *pillar* (Ex. 24, 4), sometimes with אַמּוֹה *cubit*, חֹדֶשׁ *month*, עִיר *city*, שֶׁקֶל *shekel* (compare our *four-year-old* and the German *sechzig Pfund*), e.g. Dent. 1, 2 יוֹם עֶשְׂרִי אַחֵר (comp., however, such exceptions as Dent. 1, 23. Jos. 4, 2, and elsewhere).—Substantives other than these are used in the plural with the numerals from 11 to 19, and the numeral may even follow the substantive, especially in later passages, as Num. 7, 87 sq. 1 Chron. 4, 27. 25, 5.

2. After מֵאָה (מֵאוֹת) [so almost exclusively in the Priestly Code, e.g. always אֶלֶף (אֲלָפִים, אֲלָפִים, אֲלָפִים) and מֵאוֹת (מֵאוֹתִים, מֵאוֹת, מֵאוֹתִים) the substantives אִישׁ, אַמּוֹה, אֶלֶף (except in Ezek. 40, 27), יוֹם, רִגְלִי, צֶמֶד, שָׁנָה, כֶּרֶם, שֶׁקֶל (with the exception of Jos. 7, 21. 2 Sam. 14, 26, and elsewhere); comp., moreover, Gen. 33, 19. Est. 1, 1. Jud. 21, 12. Dent. 7, 9. 1 Ki. 5, 12. 2 Chron. 9, 15.—Examples of the plural after מֵאָה are Gen. 26, 12. 1 Sam. 18, 25. 2 Sam. 16, 1. 1 Ki. 18, 4; after מֵאוֹת Ex. 38, 27; after מֵאוֹת Jud. 15, 4. 2 Sam. 8, 4. 1 Ki. 10, 17. Ezek. 42, 17; after מֵאוֹתִים 1 Sam. 25, 18. 1 Ki. 7, 20; after אֶלֶף 1 Sam. 25, 2. 1 Ki. 3, 4. 5, 6. 2 Ki. 3, 4. Ps. 90, 4; after אֲלָפִים 1 Sam. 17, 5. Job 42, 12; after אֲלָפִים Mic. 6, 7; after אֲלָפִים Is. 36, 8.—In Dan. 12, 11 the plural יָמִים precedes the numeral *twelve hundred*.

3. Numerals compounded of tens and units (like 21, 62) take the object numbered either *after* them in the singular (in the accusative), e.g. Gen. 5, 20 שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנָה *two and sixty years* (שָׁנָה in the singular, according to letter *e*, since it conforms to the ten immediately preceding; but also שְׁלֹשִׁים וְשֵׁשׁ שָׁנָה Deut. 2, 14), or *before* them in the plural, especially in the later Books, Dan. 9, 26 and elsewhere; or the object is repeated (but only in 1 Ki. 6, 1, and the Priestly

Code; sometimes even several times, e.g. Gen. 23, 1. 25, 7. 17 thrice) in the plural with the units (according to letter *b*), and in the singular with the tens (see letter *e*) and hundreds, e.g. Gen. 12, 4 חֲמִשָּׁן שָׁנִים *seventy and five years*; Gen. 23, 1 סָאָה שָׁנָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה *an hundred and twenty and seven years*. Comp. Gen. 5, 6 sqq.

- i* Rem. 1. It may further be remarked with regard to the order, that the thousand or thousands always precede the hundreds, &c., and the hundreds almost always come before the smaller numbers (in Kings and Ezekiel sometimes, and in the Priestly Code usually, after the smaller numbers), the tens in the earlier Books (documents J and D of the Pentateuch, Joshua 1–12, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, and also in Ezra and Nehemiah) before the units, but in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Priestly Code, Joshua 13–24, after the units (see Hermer, op. cit., p. 73). After the hundreds the smaller number is very frequently added *συνδέτω*, without *γ*, especially in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel.

On the syntax of the cardinals in general:—

- k* 2. The cardinals are determined by the article, when they refer back (without being connected with the object numbered; comp., however, Lev. 25, 10 sq. Num. 16, 35. Jos. 4, 4. 2 Sam. 23, 13) to a number or list already mentioned, e.g. Gen. 2, 11 שֵׁם הָאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן *the name of the one (the first) is Pishon*; Gen. 14, 9 *four kings against the five* (enumerated in verse 2); comp. 1 Chron. 11, 20 sq., and the determinate tens in Gen. 18, 29. 31 sq. A demonstrative with the article may also be added to a numeral determined in this way, e.g. Dent. 19, 9 (but comp. also Gen. 9, 19. 22, 23, where the numeral and demonstrative are practically determinate in themselves). In the case of the numerals from 11 to 19 the article may stand either before the unit (1 Chron. 25, 19. 27, 15) or before עֶשְׂרִי (Jos. 4, 4); it is used before all three members of a compound number (273) in Num. 3, 46.

- l* In apposition with some determinate substantive the cardinal number is used *without* the article, not only when it precedes the substantive, as in Jos. 15, 14 אֶת־שְׁלֹשָׁה בְּנֵי הָעֵיֶן (שָׁלֹשׁ), where שְׁלֹשָׁה is equivalent to a substantive determinate in itself; comp. Gen. 18, 28. Jos. 6, 8. 22. 1 Sam. 17, 14. 1 Ki. 11, 31, and the passages discussed above in § 126. *x*; Gen. 21, 29, &c.), but also when it follows the substantive, e.g. 1 Ki. 7, 27. 43 sq. עֶשְׂרִי וְעֶשְׂרִי; the omission of the article may here, as in the cases noticed in § 126. *x*, be also due to the dislike of a hiatus. This would also be a very simple explanation of אֶחָד Num. 28, 4. 1 Sam. 13, 17 sq. Jer. 24, 2. Ezek. 10, 9, instead of the more usual הָאֶחָד, and of אֶחָת 1 Sam. 1, 2 for הָאֶחָת.

- m* Such cases as שְׁבַע־יָמִים Jud. 14, 17 (which is determined by a following determinate genitive) are explained from § 127. *b*; 1 Chron. 9, 25 perhaps from § 126. *g*; in Is. 30, 26 probably the light of all the seven days of the week is meant; on the other hand, in 1 Sam. 9, 20 and 25, 38 the article is, with Wellhausen, to be omitted.

- n* 3. Certain specifications of *measure, weight, or time*, are commonly omitted after numerals, e.g. Gen. 20, 16 כֶּסֶף אֶלְפִּי *a thousand (shekels) of silver*; so also before וְהָבָה Gen. 24, 22. 1 Ki. 10, 16. Is. 7, 23, comp. Ps. 119, 72. Moreover, Ruth 3, 15

שֵׁשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה לֶחֶם *six (ephahs) of barley*; 1 Sam. 17, 17 *ten* (according to 10, 3 *loaves*) of bread; comp. 2 Sam. 16, 1, where before מִן a measure, or perhaps some term like *cakes*, is to be supplied.—The number of cubits is stated in the Priestly Code (Ex. 26, 2 and elsewhere) and in 1 Ki. 6 and 7 (otherwise only in Ezek. 40, 5. 21. 47, 3. Zech. 5, 2. 1 Chron. 11, 23. 2 Chron. 4, 2 sq.) by the addition of בְּאַמָּה prop. *by the cubit*. Also in Ex. 27, 11 the Samaritan and LXX read בְּאַמָּה after אֹרֶךְ, and in 27, 15 אַמָּה after עֵשְׂרֵה.

4. The *ordinals* above 10 have no special forms, but are expressed ^o by the corresponding cardinals, which may then stand either before or after the object numbered, e.g. Gen. 7, 11 יוֹם בְּשִׁבְעָה עָשָׂר *on the seventeenth day*; Deut. 1, 3 בְּאַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה *in the fortieth year*; comp. Gen. 14, 5. 2 Ki. 25, 27, and, with repetition of שָׁנָה in a compound number, 1 Ki. 6, 1; such a cardinal occurs without בְּ (and therefore in the *accus. temporis*, according to § 118. k) in Gen. 14, 4 (the Samaritan, however, has וּבְשָׁלֹשׁ); with the article (but without a numbered object, see above, letter k), 1 Ki. 19, 19¹. On the position of the numeral as a genitive following its noun, comp. e.g. 1 Ki. 16, 10 בְּשָׁנַת עָשָׂרִים וְשִׁבְעָה *in the twenty and seventh year*, and with a determinate numeral, Ex. 12, 18. Num. 33, 38. Deut. 15, 9. In this case, however, שָׁנָה is very frequently repeated, e.g. Gen. 7, 11. 2 Ki. 13, 10; after a determinate numeral, Lev. 25, 10².

Rem. In numbering days of the month and years, the cardinals are very fre- ^pquently used instead of the ordinals even for the numbers from 1 to 10, e.g. בְּשָׁנַת שְׁלֹשׁ 1 Ki. 15, 25; בְּשָׁנַת שְׁלֹשׁ 2 Ki. 18, 1, &c., comp. Deut. 15, 9. The months themselves are always numbered by the ordinals (בְּרֵאשִׁי, &c., up to בְּעָשְׂרִי), but not the days of the month, e.g. בְּאַחַד לְחֹדֶשׁ Gen. 8, 5 and elsewhere, בְּאַרְבָּעָה לְחֹדֶשׁ Zech. 7, 1; בְּחִמְשָׁה לְחֹדֶשׁ Ezek. 1, 1 and elsewhere, בְּשִׁבְעָה לְחֹדֶשׁ 2 Ki. 25, 8, בְּחִשְׁמֹנָה לְחֹדֶשׁ Lev. 23, 32 (always, however, בְּעָשָׂר לְחֹדֶשׁ *on the tenth day of the month*). On the omission of יוֹם in all these cases see above, letter n; only in late passages is יוֹם added, e.g. 2 Chron. 29, 17 בְּיוֹם שְׁמוֹנֶה לְחֹדֶשׁ Ezra 3, 6 בְּיוֹם אֶחָד לְחֹדֶשׁ.—Finally, when the year is stated by בְּשָׁנַת governing a determinate ordinal, e.g. 2 Ki. 17, 6 בְּשָׁנַת הַחֲשִׁיעִית

¹ Somewhat different from this is Ex. 19, 15 *be ready* יָמִים לְשִׁלֹּשֶׁת prop. *after three days*, i.e. *on the third day* (in verses 11 and 16 and in Ezra 10, 8 the ordinal is used), also 1 Sam. 30, 13 שְׁלֹשָׁה הַיּוֹם תְּלִיתִי הָיִים *because three days ago I fell sick*, prop. *to-day three (days)*.

² All these expressions may indeed be explained by supposing that, e.g. in Lev. 25, 10, the proper meaning is *the year of the fifty years* which it completed, i.e. the fiftieth year; but it is more correct to regard שָׁנַת בְּשָׁנָה in such cases not as a real *nomen regens*, but simply as a connective form to be explained on the analogy of the cases mentioned in § 128. k.

in the ninth year (comp. 25, 1. Jer. 23, 1 *Kth*. 32, 1 *Kth*. 46, 2. 51, 59. Ezra 7, 8), בְּשָׁנָה in such cases is again (see note 2 on letter *o*) to be explained according to § 128. *k*. This is supported by the fact that the Masora on Jer. 28, 1. 32, 1, requires in the *Qrd* בְּשָׁנָה for שָׁנָה.

q 5. *Distributives* are expressed either by repetition of the cardinal number, e.g. Gen. 7, 9. 15 שְׁנַיִם שְׁנַיִם *two and two*; 2 Sam. 21, 20 שֵׁשׁ שֵׁשׁ *six each*; with the numbered object also repeated, e.g. Jos. 3, 12 אִישׁ אֶחָד אִישׁ אֶחָד לְשִׁבְטָא *for every tribe a man*; Num. 13, 2. 34, 18 (אֶחָד כֹּן), as in Neh. 11, 1, *one out of every ten*; comp. § 123. *d*; or a periphrasis with לְ אֶחָד is used, Num. 17, 18. Deut. 1, 23, comp. Is. 6, 2 לְאַחַד after *six wings* twice repeated; the simple distributive לְ is, however, sufficient (as in לְבָרִים, § 123. *c*), e.g. לְמֵאוֹת וְלְאַלְפִים *by hundreds and by thousands*.

r 6. The *multiplicatives* are expressed either (like the ordinals above 10, see letter *o* above) by the cardinals (in the feminine, probably owing to the omission of פְּעַם, פְּעָמִים; so König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 228), as שְׁנַיִם *twice*, Job 40, 5; שֶׁבַע *seven times*, Lev. 26, 21. 24. Prov. 24, 16; comp. also אֶחָד *once*, 2 Ki. 6, 10. Job 40, 5, for which in Job 33, 14 בְּאַחַת along with בְּשָׁמַיִם (the latter also in 1 Sam. 18, 21); or by the *dual* of the numeral, thus שְׁכַעְתַּיִם Gen. 4, 15 (in verse 24 along with the cardinal 77 for 77 times); Is. 30, 26. Ps. 12, 7. 79, 12; אַרְבַּעַתַּיִם 2 Sam. 12, 6²; or periphrastically by פְּעַם *a time* (prop. *a step*, with the article, הַפְּעַם *this time*; comp. also הָאֵת הַפְּעַם, with בְּ, like בְּאַחַת above), as אֶחָד פְּעַם *once* (Neh. 13, 20 וּשְׁנַיִם פְּעַם *once and twice*), שְׁנַיִם פְּעָמִים *twice*, שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים (for which in Ex. 23, 14. Num. 22, 28. 32 שְׁלֹשׁ רִנָּלִים) *three times*; comp. Ezek. 41, 6 *thirty-three times*; 2 Sam. 24, 3 *an hundred times*; Deut. 1, 11 *a thousand times*; 1 Ki. 22, 16 עַד-כַּפָּה פְּעָמִים *until how many times*, i.e. *how often*. Cf. also עֶשְׂרֵת מָנִים *ten times*, Gen. 31, 7. 14, and רַבּוֹת עָתִידִים *many times*, Neh. 9, 28.—In Gen. 43, 34, *five times* is expressed by חֲמִשׁ יָדוֹת (prop. *five hands*)³, and in Ex. 16, 5 the *double* is expressed by מִשְׁנָה עַל- (prop. *a repetition over and above that which*, &c.).—Of the ordinals שְׁנִית is used as a numeral adverb, Gen. 22, 15, &c., *a second*

¹ But בְּאַחַת Num. 10, 4 is to be translated *on one* (trumpet).

² Probably also מְפֹלָלִים Job 11, 6 (from מְפָל *doubling*) does not mean *doubled* but *manifest*.

³ But אַרְבַּע הַיָּדוֹת Gen. 47, 24 means *the (other) four parts*; comp. 2 Ki. 11, 7. Neh. 11, 1.

time, comp. the Latin *tertium consul*; תַּשְׁלִישׁ *the third time*, 1 Sam. 3, 8; חֲמִישִׁית הַמַּעַם *a fifth time*, Neh. 6, 5; בִּשְׁבָעִית *at the seventh (time)*, 1 Ki. 18, 44, and הַשֵּׁשׁ הַמַּעַם Jos. 6, 16.

Rem. The collocation of a numeral with the next above it (either in the same or in different sentences) is a rhetorical device employed in *numerical sayings* to express a number, which need not, or cannot, be more exactly specified. It must be gathered from the context whether such formulae are intended to denote only an insignificant number (e. g. Is. 17, 6, *two or at the most three*), or a considerable number, e. g. Mic. 5, 4. Sometimes, however, this juxtaposition serves to express merely an indefinite total, without the collateral idea of a gradation from a lower to a higher number. Thus *one* and *two* are connected by וְ, Deut. 32, 30. Jer. 3, 14. Job 33, 14. 40, 5 (without וְ, Ps. 62, 12); *two* and *three*, Is. 17, 6 (Sirac. 23, 16. 26, 28), and without וְ, 2 Ki. 9, 32. Hos. 6, 2. Amos 4, 8; *three* and *four*, Jer. 36, 23. Amos 1, 3. 2, 4. Prov. 30, 18. 21. 29 (Sirac. 26, 5), and without וְ, Prov. 30, 15; *four* and *five*, without וְ, Is. 17, 6; *six* and *seven*, Job 5, 19. Prov. 6, 16; *seven* and *eight*, Mic. 5, 4. Eccles. 11, 2; (*nine* and *ten*, Sirac. 25, 7).

III. Syntax of the Pronoun.

§ 135. The Personal Pronoun.

1. The *separate* pronouns,—apart from their employment as the *a* subject in noun-clauses (comp. § 141. *a*) and the idiom mentioned under letters *d-h*,—are used, according to § 32. *b*, as a rule, only to give express emphasis to the subject; e. g. Gen. 16, 5. 2 Sam. 24, 17 אֲנִי i. e. *I myself*, so also אֲנִי 2 Sam. 12, 28. 17, 15 (after the verb). Ezek. 34, 15. Ps. 2, 6¹; but 1 Sam. 10, 18. 2 Sam. 12, 7. Is. 45, 12 אֲנִי *I* and none else; cf. also אֲנִי אֲנִי *I, I* Hos. 5, 14, &c.; אֲתָה Gen. 15, 15. Jud. 15, 18. 1 Sam. 17, 56 (as in 20, 8. 22, 18. Ex. 18, 19. Deut. 5, 24. Jud. 8, 21, after the imperative); 1 Ki. 21, 7; אַתָּם Gen. 9, 7. Ex. 20, 19 (after the verb, Jud. 15, 12); fem. Gen. 31, 6; הִיא 1 Sam. 22, 18; הִיא Gen. 3, 20. Jud. 14, 3; הִיא Jer. 5, 5. — Sometimes, however, the separate pronoun appears to be placed before the verb

¹ Also הוּא, הִיא *he himself, she herself* (of persons and things), e. g. Is. 7, 14 הוּא אֲרִנִּי *the Lord himself*; Est. 9, 1 הִיא הַיְּהוּדִים *the Jews themselves*. In the sense of the *same* (*δ αὐτός*) or (*one and*) the *same*, הוּא is used in Is. 41, 4. 43, 10. 13. 46, 4. 48, 12 (always הוּא אֲנִי), Ps. 102, 28 (אֲתָה הוּא), and probably also Job 3, 19.—The position of הִיא, as an accusative of the object, before a perfect in 1 Chron. 9, 22, can at most be explained on the analogy of Aramaic (Ezra 5, 12).

more on rhythmical grounds, i.e. in order to give the statement a fuller sound than that of the bare verbal form (cf. the similar use of the infinitive absolute, § 113. e). Thus Gen. 14, 23. Ps. 139, 2, and most clearly in such passages as Gen. 21, 24. 47, 30. Ex. 8, 24. Jud. 6, 18. 11, 9. 1 Sam. 12, 20. 2 Sam. 3, 13. 21, 6. 1 Ki. 2, 18 (in solemn promises). The same explanation applies to אֲנִי at the beginning of sentences, e.g. Gen. 24, 45. Hos. 5, 3. 10, 11. 12, 11. Ps. 39, 11. 82, 6. Job 5, 3¹.

- b Rem. 1. Different from this is the pleonastic addition of the separate pronoun immediately *after* the verb (according to Delitzsch on Cant. 5, 5 perhaps a trace of popular language), e.g. 1 Sam. 23, 22 (!). Cant. 5, 5, and (like other indications of the very late origin of the book) very frequently in Ecclesiastes, e.g. 1, 16. 2, 1. 11. 15. 3, 17 sq. &c.; comp. Delitzsch, *Das Hohelied und Koheleth*, p. 207; in Aramaic, Dan. 5, 16.
- c 2. Substantival subjects also are somewhat frequently resumed, and thus expressly emphasized, by the insertion of the corresponding separate pronoun of the 3rd person before the predicate is stated, e.g. Gen. 3, 12 *the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she* (אֵתָהּ) gave me, &c.; 14, 24 (אֵתָהּ); 15, 4. 24, 7, &c.; but אֵתָהּ in Is. 7, 14 after the predicate and subject is equivalent to *he himself*².
- d 2. Not infrequently the separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows), whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or preposition (as genitive). In English such an emphasis on the pronoun can generally be rendered only by laying greater stress upon it, or sometimes by repeating it; comp., on the contrary, the French *mon livre à moi*. The separate pronoun in such instances is not to be regarded as a *casus obliquus* (accusative or genitive), but as the subject of an independent sentence, the predicate of which must in each case be supplied according to the context.
- e Examples of emphasis:—

(a) On a verbal suffix by means of אֲנִי (אֲנִי), Gen. 27, 34 בִּרְכֵנִי נָם־אֲנִי *bless me, even me also* (prop. *bless me, I also would be blessed*); Zech. 7, 5; comp. also Ezek. 6, 3. 34, 11. 20 הִנְנִי אֲנִי; by אֵתָהּ (אֵתָהּ) Prov. 22, 19.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Gen. 24, 27 (אֲנִי); 49, 8 אֵתָהּ *not Judah, thou art he whom*,

¹ As early as the Mēša' inscription (line 21 sqq.) אֲנִי frequently stands at the beginning of a new sentence after the dividing stroke.

² Analogous to this is the resumption of a noun dependent on a preposition, by means of a pronominal suffix united with the same preposition, e.g. Gen. 2, 17. 2 Sam. 6, 22. 2 Ki. 22, 18, or of an object by means of the *nota accusativi* אֵת with suffix, e.g. 1 Sam. 15, 9. Is. 8, 13.

but *Judah thee, thee thy brethren shall praise!* but the vocative would also be possible, *Judah! thou! thy brethren shall praise thee!* as in 24, 60), and Eccles. 2, 15 **יָנִים**.

(b) On a noun-suffix with a substantive, by means of **אֲנִי** 2 Sam. 19, 1. Prov. 23, 15, *f* perhaps also Lam. 1, 16 (against the accents); by **אֶתְּךָ** 1 Ki. 21, 19 **אֶתְּךָ** **בְּדַם־אֶתְּךָ** *thy blood, even thine*; by **הוּא** 2 Sam. 17, 5. Jer. 27, 7. Mic. 7, 3; by **אֲנִי** 1 Sam. 20, 42, after **שָׁנִי**, but without special stress; Neh. 5, 2 (1); by **אֲתָם** Num. 14, 32; by **הֵם** Ps. 38, 11 (without special stress), **הִפּוֹחַ** Ps. 9, 7.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in Job 21, 4 (**אֲנִי**); Gen. 40, 16. Is. 45, 12. 1 Chron. 28, 2 (**אֲנִי**); Zech. 9, 11 (**אֲתָ**); Jos. 23, 9 (**אֲתָם**); Ezek. 33, 17 (**הִפּוֹחַ**).—In Ps. 89, 48, where **אֲנִי** might be taken as strengthening **חֹלֶד** (equivalent in sense to **חֹלֶדִי**), we should read **אֲרִי** for **אֲנִי**, as in verse 51.

(c) On a suffix united with a preposition, 1 Sam. 25, 24 **אֲנִי בִי** *upon me, upon g* *me*; 1 Ki. 1, 26 **אֲנִי . . . לִי**; 2 Chron. 35, 21 **לֹא־עָלֶיךָ אֶתָּה** *not against thee*; 1 Sam. 19, 23 **הוּא עָלָיו** *upon him also*; Deut. 5, 3 **אֲנִי אֲנִי** *but with us, even us*; Hag. 1, 4 **אֲתָם לָכֶם** *for you yourselves*; Jer. 25, 14 **בְּמִם בְּדַם־הִפּוֹחַ**.—The separate pronoun *precedes* in 1 Sam. 12, 23 **לִי . . . אֲנִי**; 1 Ki. 1, 20 **עָלֶיךָ . . . אֶתָּה**; Mic. 5, 1 **כִּסְפָּךְ . . . אֶתָּה**, and 2 Chron. 28, 10 **עִמָּכֶם אֲתָם**.

The same principle also explains Gen. 4, 26 **לְשֵׁת בְּדַם־הוּא** *to Seth, to him also h* (not **לְשֵׁתִי**); comp. 10, 21, and Ex. 35, 34. Num. 4, 22.

8. The *oblique* cases of the personal pronouns expressed by means *i* of a preposition (or the *nota accus.* **אֵת**) may be used either in a demonstrative or reflexive sense¹, as **לִי** *to him*, but also *to himself* (*sibi*), e. g. Jud. 3, 16 and *Ehud made לִי for himself a sword*, comp. Gen. 33, 17; so also **לָהֶם** *sibi*, Is. 3, 9; **אִתּוֹ** *with him*, and Gen. 22, 3 *with himself*; **עִמָּהּ** *with her*, and 1 Sam. 1, 24 *with herself*; **אֵלָיו** *unto him*, and Gen. 8, 9 *unto himself*; also apparently as a pleonastic *dativus ethicus* (see § 119. s), Job 12, 11. 13, 1.

Rarely, and only when marked emphasis is intended, is the *accusative k* of the reflexive pronoun represented by the *nota accusativi* **אֵת** with a suffix (this being ordinarily expressed by the reflexive conjugations *Niph'al* and *Hithpa'el*²); thus, **אִתּוֹ** *himself* and his habitation, 2 Sam. 15, 25; **אֲתָם** *se ipsos*, Ex. 5, 19. Jer. 7, 19 in sharp antithesis **הָאֲנִי**; Ezek. 34, 2. 8. 10. Comp. § 57 at the end, together with note 2.

Rem. There is a similar emphasis in Is. 49, 26 on **בְּשָׁרָם** and **דָּמָם** in the sense *l* of *their own flesh, their own blood*. On the sometimes demonstrative, sometimes reflexive meaning of noun-suffixes of the 3rd person singular and plural, cf. § 91. *p* and *q*. For other circumlocutions to express the idea of *self*, see § 139. *f*.

¹ As in Luther's Bible *jm* (*ihm*), *jr* (*ihr*) for *sich*, and in our version *him*, *her* for *himself*, *herself*.

² *Niph'al* according to § 51. *e* (like *Hithpa'el* according to § 54. *f*) may also include the *dative* of the reflexive pronoun.

- m 4. The *possessive pronouns* are, according to § 33. c, expressed by the *suffixes of the noun* (in the genitive)¹, which may represent either a *subjective genitive*, or (like the genitives proper, § 128. h) an *objective genitive*, e.g. *הַחֹסֶם* *the wrong done against me*, Gen. 16, 5. Jer. 51, 35; comp. Gen. 9, 2. 18, 21. 27, 13 (2 Sam. 16, 12 *K'th.*); Gen. 30, 23. 39, 21 (comp. Ex. 3, 21 and elsewhere); 50, 4. Ex. 20, 20. 21, 35. Jud. 4, 9. 13, 12 (*מַעֲשֵׂיוֹ* *the treatment of him*); Is. 56, 7. Jer. 9, 7. Nah. 3, 19. Prov. 1, 27. 24, 22. Job 20, 29. 23, 14. 34, 6. Comp. also such pregnant expressions as Ps. 20, 3 *יִשְׁלַח עֲזָרְךָ* *he will send thy help (help for thee)*, i.e. he will send thee help; Gen. 30, 18. 39, 21. Ex. 2, 9. Is. 1, 26 (*and I will restore judges for thee*); Ezek. 37, 15.

When several substantives are co-ordinated, the pronominal suffix must be attached to each singly, e.g. Gen. 36, 6 *וְאֶת-בָּנָיו וְאֶת-בָּתָּיו וְאֶת-בְּנוֹתָיו* *his wives and his sons and his daughters, &c.*; 38, 18, &c. In 2 Sam. 23, 5 the text is hardly correct.

- 11 5. When the genitive, following a construct state, is used periphrastically to express the idea of a material or attribute (§ 128. o and p), the pronominal suffix, which properly belongs to the compound idea (represented by the *nomen regens* and genitive), is, like the article (§ 127), attached to the second substantive (the genitive), e.g. *הַר-קָדְשִׁי* prop. *the hill of my holiness*, i.e. my holy hill, Ps. 2, 6 and elsewhere; *עִיר קֹדְשִׁי* *thy holy city*, Dan. 9, 24; *אֱלֹהֵי כֶסֶף* *his idols of silver*, Is. 2, 20. 30, 22. 31, 7²; comp. Deut. 1, 41. Is. 9, 3. 28, 4. 41, 11. Ezek. 9, 1 sq. Ps. 41, 10. 150, 1. Job 18, 7 *אֲזַעֲרֵי אֹמְרוֹ* *his steps of strength*; 38, 6; after an adjective as *nomen regens*, Is. 13, 3 (Zeph. 3, 11) *עֲלֵדֵי נִאֲמָתִי* *my proudly exulting ones*.—On the same analogy is the use of e.g. Deut. 1, 41 *בְּלִי סֶלַחְמָו* *his weapons of war* [cf. Is. 41, 12]; Is. 56, 7 *בֵּית הַפִּלְתִּי* *my house of prayer*, although the genitive here does not convey the idea of an attribute.

¹ Like the substantival genitive, according to § 129. h, the possessive pronoun may also be paraphrased by a relative clause, e.g. Ruth 2, 21 *הַנְּעָרִים אֲשֶׁר לִי* *the young men, which are to me*, i.e. *my young men*; so especially, when the substantive, which should take a genitive suffix, is already followed by a genitive, e.g. 1 Sam. 17, 40. In this case, however, the suffix also is sometimes attached pleonastically, e.g. Cant. 1, 6 *בְּרִכְתִּי יֵשֶׁעִי* *my vineyard, which belongs to me*. Comp. Cant. 3, 7, and the analogous pleonasm in 2 Sam. 22, 2 (but see Ps. 18, 2) and Ps. 27, 2.

² On the other hand, more explicitly in prose, Gen. 44, 2 *אֶת-נִבְעֵי הַכֶּסֶף* *my cup, the silver cup*.

Rem. 1. Through an inaccuracy, which probably passed from the colloquial language¹ into that of literature, *masculine* suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to *feminine* substantives; thus a noun-suffix in the singular, Ex. 11, 6. 25, 19. Jud. 11, 34²; in the plural, Gen. 31, 9. 32, 16. 41, 23. Ex. 1, 21. 2, 17. Num. 27, 7 (but the feminine suffix twice immediately after); 36, 6; Jud. 19, 24. 21, 22. 1 Sam. 6, 7. 10 *בְּנֵיהֶם* (9, 20. Is. 3, 16. Ezek. 23, 45. Amos 4, 1 sq. (but afterwards a feminine suffix); Job 1, 14. 39, 3 (*חַבְלֵיהֶם* in parallelism with *יָלְדֵיהֶם*); 42, 15. Cant. 4, 2. 6, 6. Ruth 1, 8 sqq. (along with feminine suffixes); verbal suffixes in the singular, Ex. 22, 25; in the plural, Jud. 16, 3. Prov. 6, 21. Job 1, 15. But Gen. 26, 15. 18. 33, 13. Ex. 2, 17. 1 Sam. 6, 10 *a* are to be explained according to § 60. *h*. On *הֵמָּה* as feminine, see § 32. *n*. On the use of the masculine in general as the *prior gender*, see § 122. *g*.

2. The suffix of the 3rd person singular feminine (as also the separate pronoun *הִיא* Num. 14, 41. Jos. 10, 13. Jud. 14, 4) sometimes refers to the verbal idea contained in a preceding sentence (corresponding to our *it*); thus the verbal suffix, Gen. 15, 6. Num. 23, 19. 1 Sam. 11, 2. 1 Ki. 11, 12. Is. 30, 8. Amos 8, 10; comp. Gen. 24, 14 (*בָּהּ thereby*), 42, 36. 47, 26. Ex. 10, 11 (*אֵתָּה that*), Is. 22, 11. 47, 7.—Elsewhere the suffix of the 3rd singular feminine refers to the plurals of things, e.g. 2 Ki. 3, 3. Jer. 36, 23. Job 6, 20. 39, 15 (but previously *הֵמָּה*), and to the plurals of names of animals, Is. 35, 7. Conversely, plural suffixes refer to collective singulars, e.g. in Gen. 15, 13. Num. 16, 3. 1 Sam. 2, 8. Zeph. 2, 7; and to a verbal idea contained in the preceding clause, in Ezek. 33, 18. Job 22, 21 (*בָּהּ thereby*), Ezek. 18, 26. 33, 19 (*עַל־יְהִיָּה on that account, thereby*)³. But the suffix in *נָתַןְּיָהּ* Deut. 21, 10 refers to the collective idea contained in *אֲנִיָּהֶם*; in Jon. 1, 3 *עַל־פָּהֶם* refers to the sailors included in sense under the term *אֲנִיָּה*. In Jos. 2, 4 read *וְהַצִּיפִים*; in Is. 30, 6 (*מִתְּחִלָּה*) 38, 16. Ps. 19, 5 (*בְּרָחֶם*) the text is most probably corrupt.

3. In a few examples the force of the noun-suffix or possessive pronoun has become so weak that the language appears to be almost entirely unconscious of it. Thus in *אֲדֹנָיִי my Lord* from the *pluralis maiestatis* *אֲדֹנָיִים* (§ 124. *i*) with the suffix of the 1st singular (always with *Qames*; and thus distinguished from *אֲדֹנָי my lords*, Gen. 19, 2), used exclusively of God, not only in addressing him (Gen. 15, 2. 18, 3. Ps. 35, 23), but ultimately (see, however, the note below), without any

¹ According to Diehl (see the title at the head of § 91. *a*), who adduces numerous instances on pp. 44 sqq. 54 sqq. 67 sq., many of these cases may be set down to corruption of the traditional text, while the sudden (and sometimes repeated) change of gender in suffixes is mainly due to the influence exercised on the copyists by the Mishnic and popular Aramaic dialects, neither of which recognizes such distinctions.

² The Masora reckons six instances of *מִפְּנֵיהֶם*, where *מִפְּנֵיהָ* would be expected (Jud. 11, 34, where, however, the text is most probably corrupt), Ex. 25, 15(?) Lev. 6, 8. 7, 18. 27, 9. Jos. 1, 7; almost all these passages can, however, be easily explained in other ways.

³ In 2 Ki. 7, 10 for *שָׁעָרָה* (the LXX read *שָׁעָרָה*) we should read *שָׁעָרָה*.

regard to the pronoun, as equivalent to *the Lord*¹. On אֲדֹנָי as a *Q^{re} perpetuum* of the Masoretes for יהוה see § 17 and § 102. *m.*

- r* A similar loss of vitality in the suffix occurs most probably in יחדו prop. *in his unitednesses*, i.e. *he &c. together*, e.g. בְּלִיְהוָה יחדו Ex. 19, 8, then, without regard to the suffix, even after the 1st person יחדו אֲנִי 1 Ki. 3, 18 in reference to two women; Is. 41, 1. Job 9, 32. Neh. 6, 2. 7; after the 2nd person, Is. 45, 20 and elsewhere. Also in בָּלָם prop. *their entirety*, but also after the 2nd person equivalent to *all together*, 1 Ki. 22, 28. Mic. 1, 2 *hear, ye peoples, all of you*, even before the 2nd person, Job 17, 10 (in 1 Sam. 6, 4 read לָכֶם with the LXX). On the redundant suffix in הִעָרְבָה Lev. 27, 23 and elsewhere, comp. § 127. *i.*

§ 136. The Demonstrative Pronoun.

- a* The demonstrative pronouns are הַזֶּה, fem. הַזֹּאת, plur. הֵנָּה (§ 34), *hic, haec (hoc), hi, &c.*, and the personal pronoun הוּא, likewise used as a demonstrative, fem. הִיא, plur. masc. הֵם, fem. הֵנָּה (§ 32. *δ*), *is, ea (id), or ille, &c., ii, eae or illi, &c.* The distinction between them in usage is that הַזֶּה (like *hic, δδε*) almost always points out a (new) person or thing present, while הוּא (like *is, ille, αὐτός, εκείνος*) refers to a person or thing already mentioned or known (see the examples below)².
- b* Rem. 1. Compare on the above the instructive examples in Gen. 32, 3. Jud. 7, 4 *of whom I say unto thee, this (הַזֶּה) shall go with thee, he (הוּא) shall go with thee* (so afterwards with negatives). Moreover, הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה *this day*, i.e. the actual day on which one is speaking or writing (Gen. 26, 33 and elsewhere), but הַיּוֹם הַהוּא

¹ Comp. the same weakening of the force of the possessive pronoun in רַבִּי prop. *my master*, from the second century A. D. onwards *the master*; so also in Syriac מֵרִי *my lord*, and ultimately as a title *the lord*; in Italian *madonna*, French *Madame, Notre Dame, Monsieur, Monseigneur, &c.* It is, however, more than doubtful, whether the regular distinction between אֲדֹנָי as a holy name, and אֲדֹנִי as an ordinary appellative is not merely due to the practice of the later Rabbis. G. H. Dalman, *Der Gottesname Adonaj und seine Geschichte* (Berlin, 1889), in an exhaustive discussion, shows that apart from the book of Daniel and the eight critically doubtful passages, in which אֲדֹנִי is used by God himself, there is nowhere any necessity to regard the suffix as *entirely* meaningless, since אֲדֹנִי is always used either in an address *to* or (like אֲדֹנִי, which also is never a mere phrase or title) in reverent language *about* God—as the Lord of the speaker—like the Assyrian *beli-ia, my Lord*. Against any original distinction between אֲדֹנִי and אֲדֹנִי it may be urged especially that when unconnected with suffixes the singular אֲדֹנִי is always used of God, and not the *pluralis maiestatis* presupposed by אֲדֹנִי.

² On הַזֶּה and הוּא standing separately as determinate in themselves, see § 125. *i.* On the use of determinate demonstratives as adjectives, see § 126. *u.*

the day or period of which the historian has just been speaking (Gen. 15, 18. 26, 32) or of which the prophet has just been foretelling (Is. 5, 30. 7, 18. 20 sqq.) and of which he continues to speak or foretell. Nevertheless הַזֶּה and הַהִיא are also found in certain common combinations where הַזֶּה would be expected, and vice versa; thus almost always הַזֶּה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה, plur. הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, but הַדְּבָרִים הַהֵם (or הַהֵם), and only in Zech. 8, 9. 15 הַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּה, Est. 1, 5. 9, 28 הַיָּמִים הַהֵם.—With a secondary sense of contempt (like Latin *iste*) הַזֶּה occurs, e.g. in 1 Sam. 10, 27. 21, 16. 1 Ki. 22, 27. Is. 6, 10, &c.; in the sense of the neuter, *this*, הַזֶּה is more common than הַזֶּה, as Is. 5, 25. 43, 9, &c., but הַהִיא more common than הַהִיא.

2. Both הַזֶּה and הַהִיא are sometimes used almost as enclitics to emphasize interrogative words (like the Latin *nam* in *quisnam*; comp. also *quis tandem*); e.g. Job 38, 2 הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *who now* (darkeneth, &c.) . . . 1 Sam. 17, 55 sq. Is. 63, 1. Jer. 49, 19. Ps. 24, 8. 25, 12, and elsewhere; הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *what now?* 1 Sam. 10, 11; *how now?* Gen. 27, 20; *why now?* Jud. 18, 24; but before the verb הַיָּמִים it is usually הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה Gen. 3, 13. 12, 18. Ex. 14, 5. Jud. 15, 11; הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *wherefore now?* Gen. 18, 13. 25, 22. 1 Sam. 17, 28. 2 Sam. 12, 23, and elsewhere.—So also הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה Is. 50, 9. Job 4, 7 sqq.; and still more emphatically הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה Ps. 24, 10. Jer. 30, 21.

3. הַזֶּה is likewise used as an enclitic (see letter *c* above): (*a*) *of place*, in such passages as Gen. 27, 21 הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *whether thou (that art here) be my son Esau?* 2 Sam. 2, 20 *is it thou?* הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *behold, here*, 1 Ki. 19, 5. Is. 21, 9¹; cf. also the strengthening of the separate pronoun by הַזֶּה Is. 43, 25 (אֲנִי הַזֶּה). 1 Sam. 7, 28. Is. 37, 16. Ps. 44, 5 (אֲנִי הַזֶּה), and הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *these are*, Gen. 25, 16. 1 Sam. 4, 8. (*b*) *of time*: הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *now*, 1 Ki. 17, 24; *just now*, 2 Ki. 5, 22, and rather frequently before words denoting number, e.g. Gen. 27, 36 הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה *twice, now*; comp. 31, 38. Job 1, 12. 7, 3. 19, 3; separated from the numeral in Gen. 31, 41 הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה elliptically for *this*, i.e. *this present period, is to me*, or makes altogether, *twenty years, &c.* The other examples are similarly elliptical.

¹ On the other hand, it is very questionable whether הַזֶּה in Ps. 104, 25 (הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה), Is. 23, 13 (הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה), Jud. 5, 5. Ps. 68, 9 (הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה) can be taken, according to the common explanation, simply as a prefixed demonstrative particle (*the sea yonder, &c.*). In Ps. 104, 25 הַיָּמִים (unless in apposition to הַזֶּה; comp. § 126. *aa*, and Zech. 5, 7, where הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה is in apposition to הַיָּמִים depending on הַיָּמִים, and also Ezek. 40, 45, where הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה is in apposition to הַיָּמִים) is most naturally taken as the subject, *this is the sea*. Is. 23, 13. Jud. 5, 5, and Ps. 68, 9 would be most naturally explained in the same way; but in these passages the text is almost certainly corrupt. In Jud. 5, 5 in fact הַיָּמִים הַזֶּה is most probably to be regarded with Moore as a very early gloss, which subsequently found its way from this passage into Ps. 68.

§ 137. The Interrogative Pronoun.

- a* The interrogative pronoun **מִי** *who* may refer either to a masculine or feminine person (Cant. 3, 6), or even to a plural, e.g. **מִי אַתֶּם** *who are ye?* Jos. 9, 8; **מִי־אַתָּה** Gen. 33, 5. Num. 22, 9 (more minutely, **מִי וְמִי** Ex. 10, 8, i.e. *who exactly, who in particular?*). It is used of the neuter only when the idea of a person is implied, e.g. **מִי־שֶׁכֶם** *who are the Shechemites?* Jud. 9, 28. 13, 17. Gen. 33, 8. Mic. 1, 5; even more boldly, with the repetition of a **מִי** used personally, in 1 Sam. 18, 18. 2 Sam. 7, 18.
- b* Moreover, **מִי** may also be used in the sense of a genitive, e.g. **מִי אֶת־בִּתִּי** *whose daughter art thou?* Gen. 24, 23. 1 Sam. 17, 55-56. 58; **מִי דְבָרִי** *whose word?* Jer. 44, 28. 1 Sam. 12, 3; in the accusative, **מִי אֶת־נַפְשִׁי** *quemnam?* 1 Sam. 28, 11. Is. 6, 8; with prepositions, e.g. **בְּמִי** 1 Ki. 20, 14 (in an abrupt question *by whom?*); **לְמִי** Gen. 32, 18; **אֶת־מִי** 1 Sam. 24, 15.—Similarly **מָה**, **מַה**, **מֶה** *what?* is used for the nominative, or accusative, or genitive (Jer. 8, 9), or with prepositions, e.g. **עַל־מָה** *whereupon?* Job 38, 6; **עַד־מָה** *quousque?* Ps. 74, 9.
- c* Rem. Both **מִי** and **מָה** are used also in indirect questions (on the merely relative distinction between direct and indirect questions in Hebrew, see the *Interrogative Sentences*), e.g. Gen. 39, 8. 43, 22. Ex. 32, 1.—On the meaning of **מִי** and **מָה** as interrogatives is based also their use as *indefinite pronouns* (equivalent to *quisquis, quodcunque* or *quicquam*), e.g. Jud. 7, 3. 1 Sam. 19, 3. 20, 4. Prov. 9, 4. 16; even **שֶׁמֶדֶר־מִי** *have a care, whosoever ye be, &c.*, 2 Sam. 18, 12; so also **מָה** (*whatever it be*) Job 13, 13. 2 Sam. 18, 22. 23; comp. Num. 23, 3 **וְדָבַר מָה־יִּרְאֵנִי** *and whatsoever he sheweth me*. A still further weakening of the *indefinite* use of **מָה** is the combination **מָה־שֶּׁ** *that which*, Eccles. 1, 9. 3, 15 (just like the Syriac **ܡܐܬܝܬ**).—On **מֵאֲמָה** *quicquam, anything at all* (usually with a negative), and as an adverb *in any way*, 1 Sam. 21, 3, see the Lexicon.

§ 138. The Relative Pronoun.

The text of this section (and of § 155) has been entirely remodelled on the basis of V. Baumann's excellent essay *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894.

- a* Relative clauses are most frequently (but not necessarily; cf. § 155. *a*) introduced by the indeclinable **אֲשֶׁר** (see § 36)¹. This is

[¹ Comp. the Assyrian *ma-am-ma*, anybody; and *mi-im-ma*, anything.—G. W. C.]

² The etymology of the word is still a matter of dispute. Against the identification of **אֲשֶׁר**, as an original substantive, with the Arabic *'aṣar*, trace, Aram. **אַשְׁרֵי**

not, however, a relative pronoun in the Greek, Latin or English sense, nor is it a mere *nota relationis*¹, but an original *demonstrative* pronoun [as though *iste, istius, &c.*]². Hence it is used—

(1) In immediate dependence on the substantival idea to be defined, and virtually in the same case as that (hence belonging syntactically to the main clause); e. g. Gen. 24, 7 . . . וַיִּקַּח אֶתְּיִשְׁלָח . . . וַיִּקַּח אֶתְּיִשְׁלָח *the Lord, isle, he took me . . . he shall send, &c. (= who took me)*; Is. 37, 4 *the words of Rabshakeh, אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר istius, the king of Assyria hath sent him (= whom the king of Assyria hath sent)*; Gen. 2, 2 *and God finished מְלֶאכֶת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה his work, istud, he had made (it)*. Such qualifying clauses may be called *dependent relative clauses*.

Rem. 1. In the above examples אֲשֶׁר Gen. 24, 7 is virtually in the nominative, Is. 37, 4 in the genitive, Gen. 2, 2 in the accusative. A further distinction between the examples is that in Gen. 24, 7 the main idea (וַיִּקַּח), to which אֲשֶׁר is added in apposition, is only resumed in the qualifying clause by the subject (*he*) inherent in וַיִּקַּח, in Is. 37, 4 it is resumed by the accusative suffix of שָׁלַח, while in Gen. 2, 2 it is not resumed at all. This suppression of the retrospective pronoun³ takes place especially when it (as in Gen. 2, 2) would represent an accusative of the object, or when it would be a separate pronoun representing a nominative of the subject in a noun-clause, e. g. Gen. 1, 7 וַיִּרְאֵהוּ אֱלֹהִים אֶתְּמַתַּחַת לְרִגְמֵהוּ *the waters, those, under the firmament, &c.* In negative sentences, however, the retrospective

place, trace, Nöldeke urges (*ZDMG.* 1886, p. 738) that the expression *trace of . . .* could hardly have developed into the relative conjunction, while the meaning of *place* has been evolved only in Aramaic, where the word is never used as a relative. According to others, אֲשֶׁר is really a compound of several pronominal roots; cf. Sperling, *Die Nota relationis im Hebräischen*, Leipzig, 1876, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 323 sqq., who follows Ewald and Böttcher in referring it to an original אֲשֶׁר. According to Hommel (*ZDMG.* xxxii. p. 708 sqq.) אֲשֶׁר is an original substantive, to be distinguished from שֶׁ and שֵׁ (an original pronominal stem), but used in Hebrew as a *nota relationis*, or (as וְהוּא and וְהוּא are also sometimes used, see below, letters *g* and *h*) simply for the *relative pronoun*. Baumann (op. cit., p. 44) sees in the Assyrian *ša*, Phoenician, Punic, and Hebrew שֶׁ, the ground-forms, of which the Phoenician and Punic שֶׁ (see above, § 36, note) and the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר are developments.

¹ Somewhat like Luther's *so*, e. g. *die fremden Götter, so unter euch sind*, Gen. 35, 2.

² This is the necessary conclusion both from the analogy of the Arabic *'alladi*, which is clearly a demonstrative (like the Hebr. הַזֶּה, הַהוּא), and from the use of וְהוּא and וְהוּא as relatives.

³ The instances in which, instead of a retrospective pronoun, the main idea itself is repeated (Gen. 49, 30. 50, 13. Jer. 31, 32) are most probably all due to subsequent amplification of the original text by another hand.

pronoun is not infrequently added, e.g. Gen. 17, 12 **וְהָיָה**; 7, 2 **וְהָיָה**; 1 Ki. 9, 20 **הַמָּוֶה**; Deut. 20, 15 **וְהָיָה**; but cf. also **אֲשֶׁר הוּא** Gen. 9, 3. The addition of **וְהָיָה** in a verbal clause, 2 Ki. 22, 13, is unusual.

The very frequent omission of the retrospective pronoun is noticeable in cases where the predicate of the qualifying clause is a *verbum dicendi*, e.g. Num. 10, 29 *we are journeying unto the place*, **אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ לָכֵם** *that place, the Lord said (of it), It will I give to you*; cf. Num. 14, 40. Gen. 3, 17. Deut. 28, 68. Jud. 8, 15. 1 Sam. 9, 17. 23. 24, 5. 1 Ki. 8, 29. Jer. 32, 43.

- c 2. When the substantive followed by **אֲשֶׁר** and the qualifying clause expresses an idea of *place*, it may also be resumed by the adverbs of place **שָׁם** *there*, **שָׁמָּה** *thither*, **מִשָּׁם** *thence*, e.g. Gen. 13, 3 **וְהָיָה שָׁם אֹהֶלָה** *unto the place, that one, his tent had been there*, i.e. *where his tent had been*; cf. Gen. 3, 23 **מִשָּׁם**, Ex. 21, 13 **שָׁמָּה**. But even in this case the retrospective word may be omitted, cf. Gen. 35, 14. Num. 20, 13. Is. 64, 10, where **שָׁם** would be expected, and Gen. 30, 38. Num. 13, 27. 1 Ki. 12, 2, where **שָׁמָּה** would be expected.—When the appositional clause is added to a word of time, the retrospective pronoun is always omitted, e.g. 1 Sam. 20, 31 *for all the days*, **אֲשֶׁר בְּנִי־יֵשִׁי חַי** *those—the son of Jesse is living (in them)*; cf. Gen. 45, 6. Deut. 1, 46. 9, 7. 1 Ki. 11, 42; see Baumann, op. cit., p. 33.

- d 3. If the governing substantive forms part of a statement made in the first or second person, the retrospective pronoun (or the subject of the appositional clause) is in the same person, e.g. Gen. 45, 4 *I am Joseph*, **אֲשֶׁר מָכַרְתָּם אֵתִי** *he—ye sold me*, i.e. *whom ye sold*; Num. 22, 30. Is. 49, 23; 41, 8 *thou, Jacob*, **אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּיךָ** *he—I have chosen thee*; Jer. 32, 19. Eccles. 10, 16 sq.; Gen. 15, 7 *I am the Lord*, **אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ** *he—I brought thee out*, &c., Ex. 20, 2 (Deut. 5, 6).

- e (2) Not depending (adjectivally) on a governing substantive, but itself expressing a substantival idea. Clauses introduced in this way may be called *independent relative clauses*. This use of **אֲשֶׁר** is generally rendered in English by *he who*, *he whom*, &c. (according to the context), or *that which*, &c. In reality, however, the **אֲשֶׁר** is still a demonstrative belonging to the construction of the main clause as subject or object, or as a genitive dependent on a noun or preposition, e.g. Num. 22, 6 **אֲשֶׁר תָּאָר יִאָּר** *is!—thou cursest (him)—is cursed*, i.e. *he whom thou cursest*, &c.¹; Ex. 22, 8; **אֲשֶׁר** as object, Gen. 44, 1. 49, 1. 1 Sam. 16, 3 sqq. Mic. 6, 1 (**אֵת אֲשֶׁר**), and even preceding the verb, e.g. Is. 52, 15. Ps. 69, 5; **אֲשֶׁר** as genitive, Ezek. 23, 28 *I will deliver thee* **אֲשֶׁר שְׂנֵאתָ** *into the hand of those—thou hatest (them)*; 1 Sam. 7, 7; depending on a preposition, e.g. **לְאֲשֶׁר** Gen. 44, 4. 2 Ki. 10, 22; **בְּאֲשֶׁר** Gen. 21, 17, **וְהָיָה שָׁם** *in that (place)—he is there*, i.e. *where*

¹ The absolute use of **אֲשֶׁר** is very peculiar in the formula **אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְּבַר יְיָ אֵלַי** *this (is it)—it came as the word of the Lord to...*, Jer. 14, 1. 46, 1. 47, 1. 49, 34.

he is; cf. Jud. 17, 8 and Ruth 1, 16 אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ *whither*¹; 1 Ki. 18, 12 אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ *whither*; כִּי־אֵשׁ Ex. 5, 11.

From these examples it follows that in independent relative clauses the retrospective suffix, or adverb of place, may be, and in fact generally is, omitted. As a rule, however (as in the dependent relative clause), this does not apply to cases in which the retrospective pronoun, by the construction of the sentence, depends on a preposition², e.g. Gen. 44, 9 sq. וְנִמְצָא . . . אִתּוֹ אֵשׁ יִפְצֹץ אֹתוֹ *he—it (the cup) is found with him,—shall die* (for the *Wāw* of the apodosis in וְנִמְצָא cf. § 143. d). In such cases אֵשׁ preceded by the preposition is quite anomalous, as in Gen. 31, 32 עַם אֲשֶׁר חִסְפָּא עִמָּךְ *with whomsoever thou findest*, where אֲשֶׁר is a relative pronoun in the English sense; on the other hand, in Is. 47, 12 (and probably also 56, 4) פְּאִשֶׁר is to be explained (with Baumann, op. cit., p. 37) by reference to 47, 15, as a demonstrative pronoun, *stand now with thine enchantments . . . with those—thou hast laboured (with them)*.

[With regard to the preceding explanation of אֲשֶׁר, the student will of course understand that, in Hebrew as we know it, אֲשֶׁר never occurs as a mere demonstrative. A particle which, whatever its origin, is uniformly used with reference to something in another, contiguous clause, will naturally have acquired in practice that force which we denote by the term 'relative.']

Like the original demonstrative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, the demonstratives הוּא, זוּ, הוּ (the last commonly)³, and sometimes the article, are used somewhat frequently in poetic language to introduce both dependent and independent relative clauses. With regard to the construction of הוּ, &c., the remarks on אֲשֶׁר, in letters *a* and *e*, also hold good.

Examples:—

(a) הוּא in apposition to a governing substantive in the nominative, Ps. 104, 26 לִיָּוִתָן הוּא־צִרְפוֹתָ (there is) *leviathan, he—thou hast formed (him)*, i. e. *whom thou hast formed*; Is. 42, 24. Jer. 30, 21; in the accusative, Is. 25, 9. Ps. 74, 2 (in both cases with a retrospective pronoun; הוּ is used without it in Ps. 132, 12); in apposition to a genitive dependent on a preposition, Prov. 23, 22 שִׁמְעוּ לְאָבִיךָ הוּא יִלְדֶּךָ *harken unto thy father, him—he begat thee*, i. e. *who begat thee*; Ps. 17, 9 (הוּ).—In Ps. 104, 8 לָהֶם הוּא יִסְדָּתָם מְקוֹם *unto the place which thou hadst founded for them* (cf. § 130. c), הוּא is in the genitive after the construct state מְקוֹם *to the place of that, thou hadst founded (it) for them*; on the same analogy we may also take, with Baumann (op. cit., p. 48), Ps. 78, 54 (וְהוּא) and Ex. 15, 13 (עַם־הוּא). 15, 16. Is. 43, 21. Ps. 9, 2. 10, 2. 31, 5. 32, 8. 142, 4. 143, 8 (all examples of הוּ).

¹ In Zech. 12, 10 also, instead of the unintelligible אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ, we should probably read אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ, and refer the passage to this class.

² Such a strong ellipse as in Is. 31, 6, where כִּי־יִפְצֹץ would be expected after וְהָעֵמִיק, is only possible in elevated poetic or prophetic language.

³ The etymological equivalent הוּא, הוּ in Aramaic is always a relative.

- h* To introduce independent relative clauses הַ is used as a nominative in Job 19, 19; as accusative, Job 15, 17 and Ps. 68, 29 (after a preposition, Ex. 13, 8; but the text is evidently corrupt).
- i* (b) More certain examples of the use of the article as a relative pronoun (more correctly, perhaps, of the demonstrative which is otherwise used as article) are 1 Chron. 26, 28 הַהֶקְדִּישׁ שְׁמוּאֵל *all that Samuel had dedicated*, &c.; 2 Chron. 29, 8 (where הַנְּמֻצָא can only be *perfect Niph'al*); 29, 36. Ezra 10, 14. In connexion with a plural, Jos. 10, 24 הַחֵיפִים הַלְלוּ אֹתוֹ *the chiefs of the men of war who went with him*; Ezra 8, 25, 10, 17. 1 Chron. 29, 17. Finally, in the sense of *id quod*, Jer. 5, 13 (where, however, we should read with the LXX הַדְּבָר). Comp. moreover 1 Sam. 9, 24 הַחֵץ הַנֶּעֱלֶה *and that which was upon it* (but see below); 2 Chron. 1, 4 בְּמָקוֹם הַכֵּין *equivalent to בְּמָקוֹם הַכֵּין לְהֵבִיךְ to the place, that he had prepared*.
- k* In all the examples adduced except 1 Sam. 9, 24 (where הַחֵץ הַנֶּעֱלֶה should probably be read for הַחֵץ הַנֶּעֱלֶה) the הַ is followed by undoubted perfects; almost all the examples, however, belong to the latest Books (Ezra and Chronicles). On the other hand, another series of instances (even in the older texts) is extremely doubtful, in which the Masora likewise requires perfects, either by placing the tone on the penultima, as in Gen. 18, 21. 46, 27. Job 2, 11 הַנְּבָאָה; Is. 51, 10 הַשִּׁמְחָה; Ezek. 26, 17 הַהֶלְלָה; Ruth 1, 22. 2, 6 and 4, 3 הַשִּׁבְחָה, or by the punctuation, Gen. 21, 3 הַנּוֹלֵד; 1 Ki. 11, 9. Dan. 8, 1 הַנְּרָאָה; Is. 56, 3 הַנּוֹלֵד, while no doubt the authors in all these cases intended participles (and indeed perfect participles, comp. § 116. d) with the article, thus הַנְּבָאָה &c., Ezek. 26, 17 הַהֶלְלָה for הַמְּהַלֵּל according to § 52. s, and in the other examples הַנּוֹלֵד, הַנְּרָאָה, הַשִּׁבְחָה.

§ 189. Expression of Pronominal Ideas by means of Substantives.

- a* Analogous to the periphrases for expressing materials and attributes by means of substantives (§ 128. o and p), is the use of substantives to represent certain kinds of pronominal ideas, for which no special expressions exist. Thus—
- b* 1. אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה *man, woman*, are used to express—
- (a) The idea of *each, every* (in the sense of each severally) with reference to persons¹, and even animals (Gen. 15, 10), e. g. Gen. 10, 5, feminine Ex. 3, 22; אִשָּׁה is the object, e. g. in Jer. 12, 15. On אִישׁ—אִשָּׁה comp. § 123. c.
- c* In a few passages אִישׁ in the above sense is placed for the sake of emphasis before the governing noun (always a substantive with a suffix), thus אִישׁ אֶחָד *at the hand of the brother of every man*. But although this explanation seems to be

¹ As a rule אִישׁ is used in the particularizing sense of *each man*, with the plural of the verb, e. g. Gen. 44, 11; sometimes, however, as subject to a verb in the singular, e. g. Gen. 44, 13.

supported by Gen. 42, 25 and Num. 17, 17, it is inconceivable that such an inversion of *nomen regens* and *rectum* should occur. It is more likely, either that the second substantive is in apposition to אִישׁ (hence Gen. 9, 5 *at the hand of every man, his brother*, i.e. who is really his brother and is therefore so much the more guilty; so 15, 10 *and he laid each or, more exactly, one piece of it, &c.*, and so probably also Num. 17, 17 *every one*, sc. *his name*), or אִישׁ precedes as a kind of *casus pendens*, and only receives its nearer definition from the following substantive with suffix; thus Gen. 41, 12. 42, 25 (according to the context = *to every one in his sack*); 42, 35, where צָרוּר־בְּסָפוֹ בְּשָׁקוֹ is virtually the predicate of אִישׁ; Ex. 12, 4. 28, 21. Num. 5, 10. 26, 54. 2 Ki. 23, 35, and especially Zech. 7, 10¹.

(b) *Any one, some one*, e.g. Gen. 13, 16. Cant. 8, 7, with a negative *no one*²; *d* so after אֵלֶּךְ Ex. 16, 19. 29; before לֹא Gen. 23, 6 and frequently.—Instead of אִישׁ we sometimes find in a similar sense אָדָם *man, homo*, e.g. Lev. 1, 2 (comp. בְּאָחֵר הָאָדָם *as any one else*, Jud. 16, 7. 11), נַפֶּשׁ (*soul*) *person*, Lev. 2, 1. 5, 1, &c., and in a neuter sense דָּבָר (prop. word, thing) equivalent to *anything*, Gen. 18, 14, or כֹּל־דָּבָר Lev. 5, 2. Num. 31, 23. With a negative דָּבָר means *nothing*; thus after אֵלֶּךְ Gen. 19, 8; after לֹא Eccles. 8, 5.—Cf. finally, מֵאֶחָד *any one*, Deut. 15, 7; *anything*, Ezek. 18, 10 (but in Lev. 4, 2. 5, 13 מֵאֶחָת) and the expressions noticed in § 144. *e*. The latter include also instances like Ezek. 18, 32 *I have no pleasure הַמָּוֶת הַזֶּה in the death of him that dieth, i.e. of any man.*

(c) In connexion with אחִיו *his brother* or רֵעֵהוּ *his neighbour*, אִישׁ *one*, masc. *e* (as אִשָּׁה *one*, fem., in connexion with אחֻותָהּ *her sister* or רֵעֻתָהּ *her neighbour*) is used to represent the ideas of *alter—alter, the one—the other*³ (in reference to persons, animals, or things without life; see the Lexicon) or the idea of *one another*, e.g. Gen. 13, 11 *and they separated themselves אחִיו מֵעַל אִישׁ מֵעַל the one from the other*; Ex. 26, 3 *five curtains יְרֵעֹת (fem.) shall be coupled together אחֻותֶיהָ אֶל־אֻחֻתָהּ one to another.*

2. נַפֶּשׁ *soul, person* expresses the idea of *self*⁴, both in the singular, Prov. 19, 8. *f* 16. 18. 29, 24. Job 18, 4 (in all cases נַפְשִׁי equivalent to *himself*), and in the

¹ Comp. on the whole question the thorough discussion by Budde, *Die bibl. Urgeschichte*, p. 283 sqq.: according to him, אִישׁ אחִיו came to be treated by the language as expressing a single idea 'one another;' and the words in Gen. 9, 5 are to be rendered *at the hand of one another* (from men mutually) *will I require it*. [In support of this view, Budde points to Zech. 7, 10 אִישׁ אחִיו אֶל־תַּחֲשֹׁבוּ בְּלִבְבְּכֶם, which in the light of 8, 17, וְאִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ אֶל־תַּחֲשֹׁבוּ בְּלִבְבְּכֶם, can only, he observes, be rendered 'and devise not the hurt of one another in your heart.' So also König, *Syntax*, § 33.]

² Comp. also אִישׁ אֶחָד Gen. 39, 11. On the expression of the idea of *no one* by means of אֵין with a following participle, see the *Negative Sentences*, § 152. 1.

³ Elsewhere הֵן . . . הֵן are used in a similar sense, Ex. 14, 20. Is. 6, 3; also הָאֶחָד . . . הָאֶחָד 2 Sam. 14, 6, or the substantive is repeated, e.g. Gen. 47, 21 (*from one end . . . to the other end*).

⁴ On the representation of this idea by pronouns, separate and suffixed, see § 135. *a* and *k*.

- plural, Jer. 37, 9 and elsewhere. Similar to this is the use of **בְּפִנְיָהּ** Gen. 18, 12 (prop. *in her inward part*) in the sense of *within herself*¹.
- g 3. **עָצָם** *bone* (then metaphorically for *existence*) expresses the idea of *self, self-same, very same*, in reference to *things* (as **נַפְשׁוֹ** to persons), e.g. **בְּעָצָם יוֹם הָיָה** *in the selfsame day*, Gen. 7, 13, comp. Jos. 10, 27. Ezek. 24, 2; **בְּעָצָם הַשָּׁמַיִם** *as it were the very heaven for clearness*, Ex. 24, 10; **בְּעָצָם רַחוּם** *in the very fullness of his strength* (equivalent to *in the midst of his full strength*), Job 21, 23.
- h 4. The simple plural of words denoting time sometimes includes also the idea of *a few, some*²; thus **יָמִים** *a few days*, Gen. 24, 55. 40, 4 (here even of a longer period, = *for some time*); Is. 65, 20. Dan. 8, 27 (on the other hand, Gen. 27, 44. 29, 20 **יָמִים אַחְרָיִם**; see § 96 and **אַחֲרָיִם**); **שָׁנִים** *some years*, Dan. 11, 6. 8.

¹ In a similar way the idea of *self* in Arabic, as in Sanskrit (*ātman*), is paraphrased by *soul, spirit*; in Arabic also by *eye*; in Rabbinic by **גוּף** *body*, **זֶרֶם** or **עָצָם** *bone*, in Ethiopic and Amharic by *head*, in Egyptian by *mouth, hand, &c.*; comp. also the Middle High German *mīn lîp, dîn lîp*, for *ich, du*. However, **נַפְשׁוֹ** in such cases is never (not even in Is. 46, 2 **נַפְשָׁם** *they themselves*) a mere otiose periphrasis for the personal pronoun, but always involves a reference to the *mental* personality, as affected by the senses, desires, &c.

² *Some* in reference to persons in Ex. 16, 20 is expressed by **אֵלֶּיךָ**, and in Neh. 5, 2-4 by **אֵלֶּיךָ** *sunt qui*, with a participle following.

CHAPTER II.

THE SENTENCE.

I. The Sentence in General.

§ 140. *Noun-clauses, Verbal-clauses, and the Compound Sentence.*

P. Dörwald, 'Zur hebr. Syntax (der hebr. Satz),' in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik*, 1890, ii. p. 115 sqq.

1. Every sentence, the subject and predicate of which are nouns *a* or their equivalents (esp. participles), is called a *noun-clause*, e.g. *יְהוָה מֶלֶכֵּנוּ* *the Lord is our king*, Is. 33, 22; *וְאֵלֵּי שָׂרִים וְזָעִים וְחַטָּאִים* *now the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners*, Gen. 13, 13; *פֶּה לָהֶם* *a mouth is theirs*, Ps. 115, 5; see further, § 141. *nominal Sentence.*

2. Every sentence, the subject of which is a noun (or pronoun *b* included in a verbal-form) and its predicate a finite verb, is called a *verbal-clause*, e.g. *וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים* *and God said*, Gen. 1, 3; *וַיִּבְדֵּל* *and he divided*, 1, 7; see further, § 142.

Rem. In the last example the pronominal subject is at least indicated by the *c* preformative (י), and in almost all forms of the perfect by affirmatives. The 3rd pers. sing. perf. however, which contains no indication of the subject, must also be regarded as a full verbal-clause.

3. Every sentence, the subject or predicate of which is itself a full *d* clause, is called a *compound sentence*, e.g. Ps. 18, 31 *הָאֵל תָּמִים דְּרָבּוֹ* *God—his way is perfect*, equivalent to *God's way is perfect*; Gen. 34, 8 *וְנַפְשׁוֹ נִפְשָׁהּ* *my son Shechem—his soul longeth for your daughter*; see further, § 143.

4. The above distinction between different kinds of sentences— *e* especially between noun- and verbal-clauses—is indispensable to the more delicate appreciation of Hebrew syntax (and that of the Semitic languages generally), since it is by no means merely external or formal, but involves fundamental differences of meaning. Noun-clauses with a substantive as predicate, represent something *fixed*,

a *state*, or in short a *being* so and so; verbal-clauses on the other hand, something *moveable* and *in progress*, an *event* or *action*. The latter description is indeed true in a certain sense also of noun-clauses with a participial predicate, except that in their case the event or action (as distinguished from that expressed by the verbal-clause) is of a fixed and abiding character.

- f Rem. By the Arab grammarians every clause beginning with an independent subject is regarded as a noun-clause, and every clause beginning with a finite verb as verbal. If a finite verb follows the noun-subject the two together (since the verb comprises its own subject and is thus a complete verbal-clause) form a compound noun-sentence, just as when the predicate consists of an independent noun-clause. Though this definition of the different kinds of sentence, which we formerly accepted (in § 144. a of the 22nd to the 24th editions of this Grammar), is rejected above, nos. 1-3, we must, nevertheless, mention here the point in which this more complicated view of the Arab grammarians may be regarded as at least relatively correct, namely, in classifying verbal-clauses according as the subject precedes or follows the verb, a distinction which is often of great importance in Hebrew also; see further, in § 142. a.

§ 141. The Noun-clause.

- a 1. The *subject* of a noun-clause (see § 140. a) may be—

(a) A substantive, e.g. וְנָהָר יָצָא מֵעֵדֶן and a river went out (was going out) of Eden, Gen. 2, 10.

(b) A pronoun, e.g. Gen. 7, 4 אֶנֶכִּי מִמָּטָר I will cause it to rain; 14, 18 הוּא כֹהֵן and he was priest; 2, 23 (וְאֵת) before a feminine predicate, as אֵלֶּה before a plural in Ex. 32, 4); מי חָכָם who is wise? Hos. 14, 10.—In 1 Chron. 5, 2 וְגִנְיָר מִכָּשֵׁי and of him one became a prince, the subject is contained in מִכָּשֵׁי¹.

- b 2. The *predicate* of a noun-clause may be—

(a) A substantive, e.g. Deut. 14, 1 וְאַתֶּם בָּנִים אֲתָם ye are children of the Lord your God; Gen. 42, 13. Specially characteristic of the Semitic mode of expression are the cases in which both subject and predicate are substantives, thus emphasizing their identity ('the thing is its measure, material, or equivalent'), e.g. Ezek. 41, 22 הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הָעֵץ וְקִירָיו עֵץ the altar (was) wood . . . , and the walls thereof (were) wood, i. e. of wood. Cf. below, letter c.

(b) An adjective or participle, e.g. Gen. 2, 12 טוֹב הָאֶרֶץ הַהִיא and the gold of that land is good; וְעֶפְרוֹן יָשָׁב now Ephron was sitting, &c.,

¹ For other remarkable instances of ellipsis in the Chronicler, see Driver, *Introduction*, p. 504 [ed. 6, p. 537], no. 27.

Gen. 23, 10¹. Very frequently such noun-clauses, attached by *Wāw* to a verbal-clause, are used to represent a state *contemporaneous* with the principal action; comp. letter *e* below.

(c) A numeral, e.g. Gen. 42, 13 שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר עֲבָדָיו *the twelve* (of us) *are thy servants*.

(d) A pronoun, e.g. Gen. 10, 12 (הֵיא), Ex. 9, 27 (אֲנִי), Gen. 24, 65 (כִּי), 1 Ki. 9, 13 (כִּהֶן).

(e) An adverb or (esp. if formed with a preposition) any specification of time, place, quality, possessor, &c., which may be regarded as the equivalent of a noun-idea, e.g. שָׁם הַבְּלִיל *there is the bdellium*, Gen. 2, 12; אֵי הָאֵל *where is Abel?* 4, 9; לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶד *his mercy endureth for ever*, Ps. 136, 1 sqq.; עֲשֵׂר בְּבֵיתוֹ *riches are in his house*, Ps. 112, 3; אֲנִי לוֹ *we are his*, Ps. 100, 3 *Qrē*.

Rem. 1. The employment of a substantive as predicate of a noun-clause is especially frequent, either when no corresponding adjective exists (so mostly with words expressing the material; comp. § 128. o) or when the attribute is intended to receive a certain emphasis. For in all cases there is a much greater stress upon a substantival predicate², where it represents something as *identical* with the subject (see above, letter *b* [a]), than upon an adjectival or verbal predicate; comp. Cant. 1, 10; Ps. 25, 10 *all the paths of the Lord are lovingkindness and truth* (i.e. *wholly lovingkindness*, &c.; comp. Jer. 10, 10; Ezek. 38, 5. Ps. 10, 5. 19, 10. 23, 5. 88, 19. Prov. 3, 17⁴. Job 22, 12. 23, 2. 26, 13. Ruth 3, 2. Sometimes the emphasis on the predicate is obtained by the use of the plural form (according to § 124. e), e.g. Ps. 110, 3 *thy people are altogether willing*; Cant. 5, 16. Dan. 9, 23.

Sometimes the boldness of such combinations is modified by the repetition^d of the subject, as *regens* of the predicate, e.g. Job 6, 12 אֲכִנִּים כֹּחֵי אֲמִלָּה *is my strength the strength of stones?* Prov. 3, 17. That the language, however—especially in poetry—is not averse even to the boldest combinations in order to emphasize very strongly the unconditional relation between the subject and predicate, is shown by such examples as Ps. 45, 9 *myrrh and aloes and cassia are all*

¹ Comp. the numerous examples in § 116. n-*p*.

² Why in these examples the pronouns, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, are to be considered as predicates and not as subjects, may be seen from what has been remarked above, § 126. *k*.

³ The same naturally applies to most of those cases which are not simple noun-clauses, but have the substantival predicate connected with the subject by הָיוּ (e.g. Gen. 1, 2 *and the earth was a waste and emptiness*; comp. Ps. 35, 6. Prov. 8, 30. Job 3, 4) or where a preposition precedes the substantival predicate, as Ps. 29, 4 *the voice of the Lord is with power*, i.e. *powerful*.

⁴ שְׁלֹמֶה here, as in Job 21, 9, is evidently a substantive after a plural subject; on the other hand, it is doubtful whether שְׁלֹמֶה in such passages as Gen. 43, 27. 2 Sam. 20, 9. Ps. 120, 7, &c., is not rather to be regarded as an adjective.

thy garments (i.e. so perfumed with them that they seem to be composed of them); Cant. 1, 15 *thine eyes are doves*, i.e. dove's eyes (but 5, 12 עֵינַיִם דּוֹלֵם); Ps. 23, 5. 109, 4. Job 8, 9. 12, 12. In prose, e.g. Ex. 9, 31. Ezra 10, 13 הָעֵת שֶׁשָּׁמַיִם מְשַׁקֵּם the season is rain showers, i.e. the rainy season; with a bold enallage of the number, Gen. 34, 30 וָאֲנִי כִּתְּחִי מִסִּפְּרִי and I (with my family) am few in number. For similarly bold expressions with הָיָה cf. Gen. 11, 1. 12, 2. Ex. 17, 12. Is. 5, 12. Jer. 2, 28, and again with a bold enallage of the number, Job 29, 15 I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. Also in prose, Num. 10, 31 and thou shalt be to us לְעֵינַיִם.

- e 2. The noun-clause connected by *wāw copulative* to a verbal-clause, or its equivalent, always describes a state *contemporaneous* with the principal action, or (when the predicate is a transitive participle) an action represented in constant duration (comp. § 107. d, as well as § 116. n and o), e.g. Gen. 19, 1 and the two angels came to Sodom at even, וָלַיְלָה אֵלֶּם while Lot sat, &c.; 18, 1. 8. 16. 22. 25, 26. Jud. 13, 9. 2 Sam. 4, 7. 11, 4 (always with a participle); with an adjectival predicate, Gen. 18, 12; with a substantival predicate, 18, 27; with an adverbial predicate, 9, 23. Not infrequently such a *circumstantial* clause indicates at the same time some contradictory fact, so that וְ is equivalent to *whereas*, *whilst*, *although*, e.g. Gen. 15, 2. 18, 27. 20, 3. 48, 14 (although he was the younger); Jud. 16, 15 how canst thou say, I love thee, וְלִבִּי בְךָ אֵין אֶתִּי whereas thine heart is not with me? 2 Sam. 3, 39. Ps. 28, 3 whilst mischief is in their hearts. These clauses describing a state are, however, only a subdivision of the large class of circumstantial clauses, on which see § 156.

- f 3. As the examples given under letters *a* and *b* show, the syntactical relation existing between the subject and predicate of a noun-clause, is as a rule expressed by simple juxtaposition, without a *copula* of any kind.

To what period of time the statement applies, must be inferred from the context; e.g. 1 Ki. 18, 21 יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים the Lord is the true God; 1 Sam. 9, 19; Is. 31, 2 וְגַם הוּא חָכָם yet he also is wise; Gen. 42, 11; on the other hand, Gen. 19, 1 וָלַיְלָה אֵלֶּם and (=while) Lot sat; Ezek. 28, 15; Gen. 7, 4 אֲנִי מְסַפֵּר I am raining, i.e. I will cause it to rain. Sometimes even a jussive or optative is to be supplied as predicate, Gen. 27, 13 upon me be thy curse; Gen. 11, 3. 20, 13. Ex. 12, 2. Cf. § 116. r, note.

- g Not infrequently, however, a connexion is established between subject and predicate (*a*) by adding the separate pronoun of the

¹ As a rule, in such comparisons וְ (which is then to be regarded as *nominative*) stands before the predicate, e.g. Is. 63, 2 wherefore are thy garments בְּגָדֵי דָבָר like those of one that treadeth in the wine-press? (prop. the like of one that treadeth, *instar calcantis*); Jer. 50, 9. Certainly, however, the comparison is then much less emphatic than in the noun-clauses cited above.

3rd person singular or plural, expressly resuming and therefore strengthening the subject, or (*δ*) (especially for the sake of a more exact specification of time) by the help of the verb הָיָה.

Examples of (*α*): Gen. 41, 26 *the seven good kine* שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים הָיָה *they are seven* *h* years; Deut. 1, 17. 4, 24; Eccles. 5, 18 מִתַּת אֱלֹהִים הִיא *this—it is a gift of God*; Num. 3, 27 אֵלֶּה הֵם; in a question, Gen. 27, 38. Sometimes הָיָה is used in this way to strengthen a pronominal subject of the first or second person¹, e.g. אֲנִי הָיָה אֲנִי Is. 43, 25 *I, even I, am he that blotteth out*, &c.; 51, 12; אֲתָה הָיָה 2 Sam. 7, 28. Is. 37, 16. Ps. 44, 5. Neh. 9, 6. 7; in an interrogative sentence, Jer. 14, 22²; in Jer. 49, 12 הָיָה in a verbal-clause strengthens אֲתָה.

Of (*δ*): naturally this does not apply to the examples, in which הָיָה, in the sense of *to become, to fare, to exist*, still retains its full force as a verb, and where accordingly the sentence is verbal, and not a noun-clause; especially when the predicate precedes the subject. On the other hand, such examples as Gen. 1, 2 *and the earth was* (הָיְתָה) *waste and emptiness*, can scarcely be regarded as properly verbal clauses; הָיְתָה is used here really only for the purpose of referring to past time a statement which, as the description of a condition, might also appear in the form of a simple noun-clause; comp. Gen. 3, 1. This is especially true of the somewhat numerous instances in which הָיָה occurs as a connecting word between the subject and the participial predicate; e.g. Jud. 1, 7. Job 1, 14 (immediately afterwards a simple noun-clause). The imperfect of הָיָה announces what is future in Num. 14, 33 and elsewhere; comp. § 116. *r*. However, especially in the latter case, הָיָה is not wholly without verbal force, but comes very near to being a mere copula, and this use is more frequent in the later Books³ than in the earlier.

Rem. On the employment of שֶׁ *existence*, and אֵין *non-existence*, which were *k* originally substantives (on their tendency to be used as verbs, equivalent to *est* and *non est*, cf. § 100. *o*, and the *Negative Sentences*, § 152) as a connecting link between a pronominal subject and a participial predicate (especially in conditional and interrogative sentences, Gen. 24, 42. 49. 43, 4 and elsewhere), see above, § 116. *g*, and the various kinds of subordinate clauses mentioned in §§ 150, 159.

4. The natural arrangement of words in the noun-clause, as describing *l* a state, is *subject—predicate*; the principal stress falls on the former since it is the object of the description. Very frequently, however (and not merely in poetry, where greater freedom is naturally allowed

¹ On a similar use of the separate pronoun of the third person in Aramaic (Dan. 2, 38. Ezra 5, 11, &c.) see Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 87. 3.

² This is of course to be distinguished from the use of הָיָה (to be inferred from the context) as predicate in the sense of *δ αὐτός*; see above, p. 459, note; or in such cases as Deut. 32, 39 *see now* אֲנִי הָיָה אֲנִי הָיָה *that I, even I, am he*; 1 Chron. 21, 17.

³ According to Albrecht, *ZAW.* 1888, p. 252, especially in Deuteronomy and in the Priestly Code.

in the arrangement of words), the reverse order is found, i.e. *predicate—subject*. The latter order *must* be used when special emphasis is laid on the predicate¹, or when it consists of an interrogative word; thus with a substantival predicate, e.g. Gen. 3, 19 אַתָּה עָפָר *dust thou art*; 4, 9, 12, 13 (*my sister*, not my wife); 20, 2, 12, 29, 14. Job 5, 24, 6, 12; with an adjectival predicate, e.g. Is. 6, 3, 28, 21. Jer. 10, 6; with a participle, Gen. 30, 1, 32, 12; with an interrogative pronoun, e.g. Gen. 24, 65²; with an adverbial interrogative, e.g. Gen. 4, 9.

m Rem. Comp. on the above the exhaustive investigations of C. Albrecht, 'Die Wortstellung im hebr. Nominalsatze,' *ZA W.* 1888, pp. 218 sqq. and 249 sqq.; with a complete list of the exceptions to the order *subject—predicate*, p. 254 sqq. The predicate *must* precede for the reasons stated (an *adjectival predicate* is particularly emphatic when it has the force of a comparative, e.g. Gen. 4, 13; the predicate expressed by means of a preposition precedes with especial frequency when it serves to convey the ideas of *having*, *possessing*, e.g. Gen. 18, 14, 29, 16 and elsewhere; comp. also 26, 20, 31, 16, 43).

n The predicate *may* precede: (*a*) when the subject is a pronoun, for 'the person as being assumed to be generally known, does not excite the same interest as that which is stated about him'; (*b*) 'in order not to be a mere appendage to a subject which consists of several words,' e.g. 2 Ki. 20, 19; (*c*) in interrogative sentences (with a substantival or adjectival predicate or one compounded with a preposition), e.g. 1 Sam. 16, 4; finally (*d*) when the predicate is adverbial or compounded with a preposition, in a relative clause, as a rule closely united (by Maqqeph) with אֲשֶׁר, e.g. Gen. 2, 11 אֲשֶׁר-הָיוּ; 1, 29 sq. אֲשֶׁר-הָיוּ.

§ 142. The Verbal-clause.

a 1. By § 140. *f* there is an essential distinction between verbal-clauses, according as the subject stands before or after the verb. In the verbal-clause proper the principal emphasis rests upon the action which proceeds from (or is experienced by) the subject, and accordingly the verb naturally precedes (*necessarily* so when it is in the perfect consecutive or imperfect consecutive). Nevertheless, the subject does sometimes precede even in the verbal-clause proper, in the continuation of the narrative, e.g. Gen. 7, 19. 2 Sam. 19, 12; especially so if there is special emphasis upon it, e.g. Gen. 3, 13 (it is not I who am to blame, but) *the serpent beguiled me*, comp.

¹ For the same reason specifications of place (e.g. Gen. 4, 7) or other adverbial qualifications may stand at the beginning of the sentence.

² The only exceptions, according to Albrecht (see the Rem. above), are Ex. 16, 7, 8.

Gen. 2, 5 and elsewhere¹. In the great majority of instances, however, the position of the subject at the beginning of a verbal-clause is to be explained from the fact that the clause is not intended to introduce a new fact carrying on the narrative, but rather to describe a *state*. Verbal-clauses of this kind approximate closely in character to noun-clauses, and not infrequently (viz. when the verbal form might just as well be read as a participle) it is doubtful whether the writer did not in fact intend a noun-clause.

The particular *state* represented in the verb may consist—

(a) Of an act completed long before, to which reference is made only because it is necessary for understanding the sequel of the principal action. If the predicate be a perfect (as it almost always is in these cases), it is generally to be rendered in English by a pluperfect; comp. the examples discussed above in § 106. *f* (1 Sam. 28, 3, &c.); also Gen. 6, 8 (not *Noah found grace*); 16, 1. 18, 17. 20, 4. 24, 1. 39, 1 (and *Joseph in the meanwhile had been brought down to Egypt*); 41, 10. Judg. 1, 16. 1 Sam. 9, 15. 14, 27. 25, 21. 1 Ki. 1, 1, &c.—In a wider sense this applies also to such verbal-clauses as Gen. 2, 6 (see further, § 112. *e*), where they serve to represent an action continuing for a long period in the past, and thus to some extent a state.

(b) Of a fact, contemporaneous with the principal events or continuing as the result of them. To the former class belong all those instances in which the predicate is combined with הָיָה (provided that הָיָה has not, as in Gen. 1, 2. 3, 1, &c., been weakened to a mere copula, in which case the precedence of the subject is fully explained from the character of the clause as a noun-clause; comp. § 141. *i*, and the examples of הָיָה, &c., with a participle, § 116. *r*); as an example of the second class, comp. e.g. Gen. 13, 12 אַבְרָהָם יָשַׁב בְּאֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן וְגו' *Abraham accordingly continued to dwell in the land of Canaan, but Lot dwelt, &c.*

Rem. 1. The close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and actual noun-clauses, is seen finally from the fact that the former also are somewhat frequently added with וְ (or subordinated) to a preceding sentence in order to lay stress upon some accompanying circumstance; on such noun-clauses describing a *state* or *circumstance*, cf. § 141. *e*. This is especially the case, again, when the circumstance which follows involves an antithesis; comp. Gen. 18, 18 *seeing that nevertheless Abraham shall surely become, &c.*; 24, 56. 26, 27. Is. 29, 13. Jer. 14, 15. Ps. 50, 17. Job 21, 22, and such examples as Gen. 4, 2. 4. 29, 17, where by means of וְ a new subject is introduced in express antithesis to one just mentioned. Moreover, in the examples treated above, in letters *b* and *c* (1 Sam. 28, 3, &c.), the subject is frequently introduced by וְ, which then corresponds to the Greek δέ, used to interpose an explanation, &c., see Winer, *Gramm. des newest. Sprachidioms*, § 53. 7. *b*.

¹ This of course applies also to the cases, in which the subject consists of a strongly emphasized personal pronoun, e.g. Gen. 32, 13 אַתָּה תִּשָּׁא *thou thyself*; 33, 3 אֲנִי *he himself*.

e 2. By a peculiar construction verbal-clauses may be joined by means of וְ and a following subject to participial clauses, e.g. Gen. 38, 25 וְהָיָה שְׁלֹחָהּ וְהָיָה כְּשֶׁנִּשְׁלָחָהּ *she was already brought forth, when she sent, &c.*; 44, 3. 4. Jud. 18, 3. 19, 11. 2 Sam. 20, 8; for other examples, see § 116. *u* (according to the remarks there made, note 1, the apodosis also frequently appears in the form of a *noun*-clause, a further proof of the close relation between verbal-clauses beginning with the subject and noun-clauses proper). Without doubt there is in all these cases a kind of inversion of the principal clause and the temporal subordinate clause; the latter for the sake of greater emphasis being raised to an independent noun-clause, while the real principal action is added as though it were an accompanying circumstance, and hence in the form of an ordinary circumstantial clause.

f 2. According to what has been remarked above, in letter *a*, the natural order of words within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject*, or *Verb—Subject—Object*. But as in the noun-clause (§ 141. *l*) so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position¹. Thus the order may be:—

(*a*) *Object—Verb—Subject*: Gen. 30, 40. 1 Sam. 2, 9. 15, 1. 2 Ki. 23, 19 and frequently. Naturally the examples are far more numerous, in which the object precedes a verbal form which includes the subject in itself, e.g. Gen. 3, 10. 14. 18. 6, 16. 8, 17. 9, 13. 37, 4. Ex. 18, 23. Jud. 14, 3. 1 Sam. 18, 17. 20, 9. 21, 10. 2 Ki. 22, 8. Prov. 13, 5 and elsewhere.

(*b*) *Verb—Object—Subject*: Gen. 21, 7. Num. 5, 23. 1 Sam. 15, 33. 2 Sam. 24, 16 (but הַמֵּלֶךְ is probably only a subsequent addition); Is. 19, 13. Ps. 34, 22. Job 11, 19 and elsewhere.

(*c*) *Subject—Object—Verb*: Is. 3, 17. 11, 8. 13, 18. Hos. 12, 11. Ps. 6, 10. 11, 5. Job 29, 25².

¹ Not infrequently also the striving after *chiasmus* mentioned in § 114. *r*, note, occasions a departure from the usual arrangement of words.

² This sequence occurs even in prose (Gen. 17, 9. 23, 6 and elsewhere); it is, however, more doubtful here than in the above prophetic and poetical passages, whether the preceding subject should not be regarded rather as the subject of a compound sentence (§ 143), the predicate of which is an independent verbal-clause; this would explain why the verbal-clause is usually separated from the subject by one of the greater distinctives.—On the other hand, the sequence *Subject—Object—Verb* is quite common in Aramaic (e.g. Dan. 2, 7. 10); comp. Gesenius, *Comm.* on Is. 42, 24, and Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 84. 1. *b*. The pure Aramaic usage of placing the *object* before the *infinitive* occurs in Hebrew in Lev. 19, 9. 21, 21. Deut. 28, 56. 2 Sam. 11, 19. Is. 49, 6. 2 Chron. 28, 10. 31, 7. 36, 19 (?).

(d) *Object—Subject—Verb* (very rarely): 2 Ki. 5, 13. Is. 5, 17. 28, 17. Ps. 51, 5¹.

(e) A substantival complement of the verb *היה* is placed first in Is. 18, 5 *וְהָיָה נָחֵם וְהָיָה נָחֵם* and *a ripening grape the flower becometh*.

Rem. Of specifications compounded with a prepositional those of *place* stand regularly after the verb, unless they are specially emphatic as e.g. Gen. 19, 2. 30, 16. 32, 5. Mic. 5, 1. Est. 9, 12; in Gen. 29, 25 *בְּרָחֶל* with *בְּ* *pretii* precedes for the sake of emphasis. Comp., however, in Gen. 35, 13 the order *verb—specification of place—subject*. The remoter object precedes for the sake of emphasis, e.g. in Gen. 13, 15 (26, 3). 15, 3; even before the interrogative, Gen. 27, 37 (cf. Jer. 22, 15 where the subject precedes an interrogative, and 1 Sam. 20, 8. Job 34, 31 where a prepositional specification precedes). Prepositional specifications of *time*, such as *בְּרֵאשִׁית* (Gen. 1, 1), *בַּיּוֹם*, *וְהָיָה* &c. (but not *בְּרֵאשִׁית*, nor the simple *רֵאשִׁית*, *בְּתַחֲלָה*, *לְעוֹלָם*), stand, as a rule, before the verb, provided it be not in the perfect consecutive or imperfect consecutive; so also certain adverbs of time, such as *אָז*, *עַתָּה*, whilst others like *עוֹר*, *תָּמִיד* regularly follow the verb.

§ 143. The Compound Sentence.

A compound sentence (§ 140. d) is formed by the juxtaposition *a* of a subject* (which always precedes, see letter c) and

(a) An independent noun-clause, which (*a*) refers to the principal subject by means of a pronoun, e.g. Nah. 1, 3 *יְהוָה בְּסוּפָהּ דָּרְכוֹ* *the Lord—in the storm is his way*; 2 Sam. 23, 6. Ps. 18, 31. 104, 17. 125, 2. Eccles. 2, 14; comp. also Gen. 34, 23, where the predicate is an interrogative clause.—A personal pronoun is somewhat frequently used as the principal subject, e.g. Is. 59, 21 *וְאֲנִי וְאַתָּה בְּרִיתִי אִתָּם* *and as for me, this is my covenant with them*, &c.; Gen. 9, 9. Is. 1, 7. 17, 4. 1 Chron. 28, 2³; with an interrogative noun-clause, Gen. 37, 30. Job 21, 4. 38, 19:—or (*β*) is without a retrospective suffix (in which case naturally the connexion between the subject and predicate is much looser), e.g. 1 Sam. 20, 23 *and as touching the matter*

¹ This sequence occurs more frequently in noun-clauses with a participial predicate, e.g. Gen. 37, 16. 41, 9. 2 Sam. 13, 4, &c., in interrogative sentences, e.g. 2 Ki. 6, 22. Jer. 7, 19; in all which cases the emphasized object is placed before the natural sequence of *subject—predicate*. [Cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 208.]

² In Gen. 31, 40 a verbal-clause (*וְהָיָה* *I was*) occurs instead of the subject, and is then explained by another verbal-clause.

³ In 1 Chron. 28, 2 (comp. also 22, 7 *וְאֲנִי הָיָה עִם־לִבִּי*) *וְאֲנִי* might also be taken as strengthening the pronominal suffix which follows (equivalent to *I myself had it in my mind*), as e.g. Ezek. 33, 17 *whereas their own way is not equal*; comp. § 135. f.

which, &c. . . behold the Lord is between thee and me for ever ;
Prov. 27, 2.

- b* (δ) An independent verbal-clause: (α) with a retrospective suffix ¹, e.g. Gen. 9, 6 (comp. § 116. *w*) ; 17, 15 *as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai* ; 26, 15. 28, 13. 34, 8. Ex. 30, 37. 32, 1. 1 Sam. 2, 10. 2 Ki. 10, 29. Is. 9, 1. 11, 10. Ezek. 33, 2. Hos. 9, 11. Ps. 11, 4. 46, 5. 65, 4. 74, 17. Dan. 1, 17 ; with a pronoun as the principal subject, Gen. 24, 27 ; (β) without a retrospective suffix, Is. 19, 17 *every one that mentions it* (Judah) *to it* (Egypt), *it* (Egypt) *is afraid*.

- c* Rem. 1. In all the above examples prominence is given to the principal subject (by its mere separation from the context by means of a greater distinctive, as a *casus pendens*²) in a manner which would be quite impossible in a simple noun or verbal-clause (e.g. Nah. 1, 3 if it were יְהוָה בְּסוֹפָה (הַרְרָה יְהוָה בְּסוֹפָה) ; comp. the French *c'est moi qu'on a accusé*. But the statement or question contained in the clause which forms the predicate also receives greater weight. For the same purpose other members of the sentence also are sometimes placed at the beginning and resumed again by a following suffix ; thus the object, Gen. 13, 15. 21, 13. 35, 12. 47, 21 (with the Samaritan and LXX read הָעֵצִים) ; 1 Sam. 25, 29 ; a specification of place, Gen. 2, 17. 2 Ki. 22, 18 and elsewhere ; a substantive with הַ, 1 Sam. 9, 20. 2 Sam. 6, 23 ; comp. the examples in § 135. *a*.—In Num. 15, 29 a dative is co-ordinated with the *casus pendens*, i.e. there is a transition to a different construction.

- d* 2. To compound sentences belong also the numerous examples already treated in the account of the tenses, where the predicate of a *casus pendens* is introduced by the *wāw apodosis*. The isolation and prominence of the principal subject is in this case still more marked than in the instances treated above ; on the *casus pendens* with a following imperfect consecutive (e.g. Jer. 6, 19. 33, 24), cf. § 111. *h* ; with a following perfect consecutive (e.g. Ex. 4, 21. 12, 44. Num. 23, 3. 1 Sam. 25, 27. 2 Sam. 14, 10. Is. 9, 4. 56, 6 sq.), § 112. *t* and *mm* ; on the participle as *casus pendens*, § 112. *oo* and § 116. *w*.—In Job 15, 17 *wāw apodosis* follows with the cohortative ; in Job 23, 12. Ps. 115, 7 the imperfect is separated by אֲנִי from the *wāw apodosis* ; in Job 4, 6 as for *thy hope*, it is *the integrity of thy ways*, and 36, 26, an incomplete noun-clause is appended by *wāw apodosis*. On *wāw apodosis* after disconnected specifications of time, comp. § 112. *oo* at the end, and Gen. 40, 9. 2 Sam. 15, 34 וְעַתָּה וְאֲנִי עֲבָדְךָ and *now* (so far as the present is concerned) *I will be thy servant*, Num. 12, 12.

- e* 3. Sometimes a substantive introduced by הַ (*in respect to* ; comp. § 119. *w*) serves the same purpose as the *casus pendens* beginning the sentence, as Num.

¹ Comp. the Mēša' inscription, l. 31 and *Horonain, therein dwelt*, &c.

² But this term must not (any more than that formerly used 'the subject preceding absolutely') be misunderstood to mean that the principal subject is, as it were, floating in the air, and that the whole sentence results in an anacoluthon. On the contrary, to the Semitic mind, such sentences appear quite as correctly formed as ordinary noun and verbal-clauses.

18, 18 (unless the ל here serves to introduce the object, according to § 117. a); Is. 32, 1 (where, however, מִי־לִי should most probably be read); Eccles. 9, 4. 1 Chron. 7, 1. 24, 20 sqq. 2 Chron. 7, 21. On the other hand, Ps. 16, 3. 17, 4. 32, 6. 89, 19. 119, 91 are very doubtful. The suggestion of P. Haupt (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, xiii. no. 114; Baltimore, 1894) also deserves attention, that in passages like Eccles. 9, 4, and in לִי־לִי Gen. 9, 10. 23, 10. Ex. 27, 3. 19. Ezek. 44, 9, &c., ל is not the preposition, but an emphasizing particle, answering to the Arab. *lā*, *surely*; Assyrian *lā*; with לִי it is equivalent to *in short*. Cf. also לִי—לִי *sive—sive, et—et*, Jos. 17, 16. Ezra 1, 11, Assyrian *lā—lā*.

§ 144. *Peculiarities in the Representation of the Subject*
(especially in the Verbal-clause).

1. According to § 40 sqq. most forms of the finite verb include *a* a specification of the subject in the form of *personal affirmatives* (in the imperfect also in the form of preformatives). Not infrequently, however, masculine forms are used with reference to the feminine, e.g. מִי־לִי Ezek. 23, 49; מִי־לִי Ruth 1, 8; in the imperfect, Joel 2, 22. Cant. 2, 7; in the imperative, Amos 4, 1. Zech. 13, 7 (for other examples, see § 110. b). On emphasizing the pronominal subject by the addition of the separate pronoun, see § 135. *a* and *b*.

On the masculine as *prior gender*, cf. § 122. *g*; on similar anomalies in the use of the personal pronoun, § 135. *o*, in the connexion between substantive and adjective, § 132. *d*, between subject and predicate, § 145. *p*, *t*, *u*.

2. The third person singular is frequently used impersonally, *b* especially in the masculine, e.g. וָיָרָא and *it came to pass*, וָיָרָא and *it shall come to pass*; וָיָרָא followed by לוֹ, &c., *it became hot to him*, i. e. *he became angry*, Gen. 4, 6 and elsewhere; לוֹ וָיָצַר lit. *and it became strait to him, he was distressed*, Gen. 32, 8¹; even יָרָא like the German *es giebt, there is* (followed by an accusative), Prov. 13, 10. Job 37, 10; on Gen. 38, 28, see letter *d* below; also in the feminine, e.g. 1 Sam. 30, 6 (Jud. 10, 9) וָיָצַר לָהּ; Jud. 11, 39. Jer. 7, 31. Ezek. 12, 25. Job 15, 32; comp. also the impersonal passives, Is. 1, 6. 29, 6. Prov. 15, 6. Somewhat different are the instances in which the 3rd singular feminine occurs as the predicate of a feminine subject

¹ In Arabic and Ethiopic the masculine is commonly used in this case, in Syriac the feminine. The forms חַם *hot*, טוֹב *good, well*, מַר *bitter*, צָר *narrow*, רָע *evil* (frequently joined with לוֹ, לָהּ, &c.), which many regard as impersonal, are no doubt to be regarded in most cases not as forms of the 3rd pers. sing. perf., but, with Hupfeld on Ps. 18, 7, as adjectives.

which is not mentioned, but is before the mind of the speaker, e.g. Is. 7, 7. 14, 24. Jer. 10, 7. Job 4, 5. 18, 15 (in 2 Ki. 24, 7 **בְּלִילֵי** is used in this way with a feminine predicate, and in Jer. 19, 5 **אֵשׁ** alone); different, too, are the instances in which the 3rd singular masculine refers to an act just mentioned, e.g. Gen. 17, 11 **וְהָיָה** and *this* (the circumcision) *shall be a token of a covenant, &c.*

- c Rem. The expressions for natural phenomena may be either in the 3rd sing. masculine or feminine, e.g. **וַיֵּאֱלֹהִים** *it becomes light*, 1 Sam. 29, 10 (but with an explicit subject, Gen. 44, 3); **וַיֵּאֱלֹהִים** *and it became light*; so also **וַיִּשְׁקַח** *it grows dark*, Jer. 13, 16; but **וַיִּשְׁקַח** Mic. 3, 6; **תֵּעָפָה** *though there be darkness*, Job 11, 17; **תִּסְחָר** *it rains*, Amos 4, 7 (where, however, the context requires the reading **אֲסָחַר**); Ps. 50, 3 **נִשְׁעָרָה** *it is tempestuous*.

- d 3. The indefinite personal subject (our *they*, one, the French *on*, and the German *man*¹) is expressed—

(a) By the 3rd person singular masculine, e.g. **קָרָא** *one* (sc. any one who named it, see the Rem.) *called* (or *calls*), Gen. 11, 9. 16, 14. Ex. 15, 23, comp. Is. 9, 5; **וַיֹּאמֶר** *one said*, Gen. 48, 1. 1 Sam. 16, 4. 19, 22²; other examples are Gen. 38, 28 *one put out a hand*; Num. 23, 21. 1 Ki. 22, 38. Is. 6, 10 **וַיִּרְפָּא** *and one heals them*; 8, 4 (**וַיִּצְאָה**); 46, 7 (**וַיִּצְעַק**); Am. 6, 12. Mic. 2, 4. Job 27, 23; by the 3rd singular feminine (**וַיֵּלֶךְ**) Num. 26, 59.

- e Rem. The Jewish commentators, following the Arab grammarians, usually explain these singulars by the addition of the participle (generally determinate) of the same stem, e.g. **קָרָא וַיִּקְרָא**. As a matter of fact, such a complement sometimes occurs, e.g. Is. 16, 10 **וַיִּרְדֵּף הַדִּרְדָּר** *the treader treads out*, for *one treads out*; 28, 4, 24 (*doth one plow continually?*); Deut. 17, 6 (Ezek. 18, 32). Deut. 22, 8. 2 Sam. 17, 9 (Ezek. 33, 4). Jer. 9, 23; with an indeterminate participle (as in Arabic, e.g. *qāla qā'ilun*, a sayer says, i. e. *some one says*), e.g. Num. 6, 9. Amos 9, 1; cf. above, § 116. i. [Comp. Driver, on 1 Sam. 16, 4.]

- f (b) Very frequently by the 3rd plural masculine, e.g. Gen. 29, 2 *for out of that well* **וַיִּשְׁקוּ** *they watered* (German *tränkte man*) *the flocks*; 26, 18. 35, 5. 41, 14. 49, 31. 1 Ki. 1, 2. Is. 38, 16. Hos. 12, 9. Job 18, 18. 34, 20. Est. 2, 2. Neh. 2, 7.

¹ In 1 Sam. 9, 9 **הָאִישׁ** (prop. *the man*) is used in exactly the same sense as our *one*.

² Elsewhere in such cases **וַיֵּאֱמָר** usually occurs (but not in the perfect, e.g. 1 Sam. 23, 22), so that it is doubtful whether the present reading of Gen. 48, 1, &c., would not be better explained according to § 7. d, note 2. In Gen. 48, 2 for the extraordinary **וַיִּנָּד** the common form **וַיִּנְד** is to be read; so in 50, 26 for **וַיִּדְעוּ** (after a plural) either **וַיִּדְעוּ** or the 3rd plur.; in 2 Ki. 21, 26 **וַיִּקְרָא**.

Rem. The 3rd plur. also is sometimes used to express an indefinite subject, § where the context does not admit of a human agent or at least not of several, e.g. Gen. 34, 27. In such a case the 3rd plur. comes to be equivalent to a passive, as very commonly in Aramaic (see Kautzsch's *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 96. 1. c); e.g. Job 7, 3 *wearisome nights* כְּנִי קִנְיָן *have they allotted to me* (equivalent to *were allotted to me*; to make 'invisible powers' the subject is a merely artificial device); Job 4, 19. 6, 2. 18, 18. 19, 26. 34, 20. Ezek. 32, 25. Ps. 63, 11. Prov. 2, 22 (in parallelism with a passive); 9, 11.

(c) By the 2nd singular masculine, e.g. Is. 7, 25 לֹא תָבוֹא שָׁמָּה *h* one will (or can) not come thither (prop. *thou wilt* . . .); Jer. 23, 37. Prov. 19, 25. 30, 28 (unless the reading should be פִּתְּחֵם). Comp. also פִּתְּחֵם עַד־בָּאֵי or simply פִּתְּחֵם (Gen. 10, 19. 30. 13, 10 פִּתְּחֵם) prop. *until thy coming*, i.e. *until one comes*.

(d) By the plural of the participle, e.g. Jer. 38, 23 *and all thy wives* וְכָל־נְשֵׁי־כִיֹּסֶיךָ *i* and *thy children* וְכָל־בְּנֵי־כִיֹּסֶיךָ (prop. *are they bringing out*) *they will bring out*, &c.; comp. Is. 32, 12. Ezek. 13, 7. Neh. 6, 10 (*for some are coming to slay thee*) and the passages discussed above, § 116. ¹ In 1 Ki. 5, 1 the text is corrupt.

(e) By the passive, e.g. Gen. 4, 26 אָז הָחֵל לִקְרֹא *k* then (*was it begun* =) *began men to call upon*, &c.

4. A peculiar idiom, and one always confined to poetic language, *l* is the not infrequent occurrence of two subjects in a verbal sentence ², one of the person and the other of the thing. The latter then serves—whether it precedes or follows—to state the instrument, organ, or member by which the action in question is performed, and may be most often rendered in English by an adverb, as a nearer definition of the manner of the action. All the examples of this kind have this in common, that the subject denoting the thing takes a suffix in the same person as the personal subject ³. They are thus distinguished from the *accusatives* treated in § 117. *s*, with which they are often confused.

¹ That this form of expression also (see letter *g*) comes to be equivalent to a passive, is seen from the analogy of such Aramaic passages as Dan. 4, 22, which exclude any idea of human agency. Comp. Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, § 76. 2. *e* at the end, and in post-bibl. Hebrew, e.g. *Pirqe Aboth* 2, 16. 3, 5 and elsewhere.

² Two subjects occur in a noun-clause in Ps. 83, 19.

³ In Ex. 6, 3 שָׁמַיִם is subordinated to the following passive נִדְרָעָה (§ 121. *b*); in 1 Sam. 25, 26. 33 יְרֵי, יָדָי are subjects to the infinitive absolute וְנִשְׁעָה, according to § 113. *gg*. In Ps. 69, 11 read וְאֶעֱשֶׂה for וְאֶבְכֶּה.

- m* (a) Examples where the subject denoting the *thing* precedes, קוֹלִי אֶל־יְהוָה אֶמְרָא *my voice—I cry unto the Lord*, i. e. *I cry aloud unto the Lord*, Ps. 3, 5. 27, 7. 142, 2; פִּי־יִרְאָתִי *my mouth—I cried*, i. e. *I cried aloud*, Ps. 66, 17 (comp. 17, 10); Is. 26, 9 נַפְשִׁי with *my soul*, i. e. *fervently*, and parallel with it אֶת־רוּחִי; but נַפְשִׁי Ps. 57, 5 is rather a periphrasis for the 1st pers. *I*.
- (b) Where the subject denoting the *thing* follows, קוֹלִי צִוִּיתִי *cry—thy voice* (i. e. *aloud*), Is. 10, 30; so also after an imperative, Ps. 17, 13 (חֲרִבֶּךָ) and 14 (יִדְּךָ); 60, 7. 108, 7 (יִמְיִנֶךָ); after a perfect, Hab. 3, 15 (סוּסֶיךָ); after a cohortative, Ps. 108, 2 (אֶת־עֲבֹדֶיךָ). The subject denoting the *thing* stands between the personal subject and the predicate in Ps. 44, 3 יְרֵךְ אֱמַתִּי¹.
- n* Rem. 1. Sometimes (as in other languages) an action is ascribed to a subject which can only have been performed at his direction by another person; comp. e. g. Gen. 40, 22 (41, 13). 41, 14. 43, 34 (*and he commanded to set before them, &c.*); 46, 29. 2 Sam. 12, 9.
- o* 2. Supposed ellipses of a definite subject are due either to a misunderstanding of the passage, or to a corruption of the text. Thus in 1 Sam. 24, 11 after הִתְנַחֵם either עֵינַי has dropped out (through confusion with עֵלְיָךְ) or we should read with the LXX הִתְנַחֵם. In 2 Sam. 13, 39 (וַתִּבֶּלֶת דָּוִד) the text is obviously corrupt.
- p* 3. In poetic (or prophetic) language² there sometimes occurs (supposing the text to be correct) a more or less abrupt transition from one person to another. Thus from the 2nd to the 3rd pers. (i. e. from an address to a statement), Gen. 49, 4 (?). Is. 22, 19. 31, 6 (?). 42, 20. Mal. 2, 15 (where, however, for יִבְלֶד we should undoubtedly read תִּבְלֶד); Ps. 22, 9; in a relative clause, Is. 54, 1, comp. also Is. 22, 16. 52, 14 sq. 61, 7. From the 3rd to the 2nd pers., Deut. 32, 15. Is. 1, 29 (?). 5, 8. Jer. 29, 19. Job 16, 7, comp. also Deut. 32, 17. From the 1st to the 3rd pers., Lam. 3, 1 (in a relative clause). In Job 13, 28 the 3rd pers. הוּא is probably employed *deiktikōs* for the 1st.

§ 145. *Agreement between the Members of a Sentence, especially between Subject and Predicate, in respect of Gender and Number.*

- a* 1. As in other languages, so also in Hebrew, the predicate in general conforms to the subject in gender and number (even when it is

¹ In several of the examples quoted above it might naturally be supposed that the subject denoting the thing (especially when it follows the verb) is to be explained rather as a *casus instrumentalis*, i. e. as an accusative, analogous to the adverbial accusatives treated in § 118. *q*. But although it is true that the subject denoting the thing often defines more closely the manner in which the action is performed, and although in similar (but still different) examples, Ps. 89, 2. 109, 30. Job 19, 16, פִּי occurs with אֶת *instrumentale*, the explanation given above must nevertheless be accepted.

² In prose, Lev. 2, 8; but וְהִתְנַחֵם here is hardly the original reading. Different from this is Gen. 26, 7, where there is a transition to direct narration.

a pronoun, e.g. *זאת בריתי* *this is my covenant*, Gen. 17, 10). There are, however, numerous exceptions to this fundamental rule. These are due partly to the *constructio ad sensum* (where attention is paid to the meaning rather than to the grammatical form; see letters *b-l* below), partly to the position of the predicate (regarded as being without gender) *before* the subject.

2. Singular nouns which include in themselves a collective idea *b* (§ 123. *a*), or which occasionally have a collective sense (§ 123. *b*), may readily, in accordance with their meaning, be construed with the plural of the predicate, whether it precedes or follows. This is also the case, when the collective is itself feminine but represents, exclusively or at least generally, masculine persons.

Examples:—

(*a*) Of collectives proper: (*a*) with the predicate preceding, Gen. 30, 38 *c* *חֲבָאֵי הָעֵאָף* (comp. verse 39. 31, 8 and 33, 13); Jud. 1, 22 sq. *בָּיִת* representing persons belonging to the tribe; Mic. 4, 3 *גֹּאֵי*; 2 Ki. 25, 5 *חֵיָל* *army*; Prov. 11, 26 *לֵאמֹם* *the people*; Num. 10, 3 *כָּל־הַעֲדָה* *all the congregation* (comp. 1 Ki. 8, 5); 1 Ki. 1, 40. Is. 9, 8. 25, 3. Amos 1, 5 *עַם*; 1 Sam. 17, 47. Ezra 10, 12 *קָהָל* *assembly*. Comp. also the construction of national names, as *אֲרָם* (§ 122. *d*), e.g. 1 Ki. 20, 20 *וַיָּבֹאוּ הַסִּירְיָאִים* *and the Syrians fled*; 1 Sam. 4, 5.—(*b*) with the predicate following, 1 Ki. 8, 5 *וַיִּבְרָךְ צֹאן וּבָקָר* *sheep and oxen*, construed with the plural in the following relative clause; Job 1, 14 *הַבָּקָר הָיָה חֹרְשׁוֹת* *the cattle (cows) were ploughing*; 2 Sam. 3, 1 and 1 Chron. 10, 6 *בֵּית* = *family*, and in a place-name, 1 Sam. 6, 13; Hos. 11, 7. Ezra 4, 4 *עַם*; Ps. 68, 11 *חֵיָה* *herd*; Is. 26, 19 *נִבְלָה* *a heap of dead bodies*; Is. 27, 11 *קִצִּיר* *boughs*; 1 Sam. 4, 1 *יִשְׂרָאֵל*, preceded by a predicate in the singular.

(*b*) Of substantives occasionally used as collectives: (*a*) with the predicate preceding, Gen. 34, 24 *וַיִּבְרָךְ*; Jud. 9, 55. 15, 10 *אִישׁ*; Is. 16, 4 *רֹמֵם* *the treader down*.—(*b*) with the predicate following, Job 8, 19 *אֲחֵר* = *others*; Ezek. 28, 3 *קְרִיפִים* *a secret*.

(*c*) Of feminines as collective terms denoting masculine persons: (*a*) with the predicate preceding, 1 Sam. 17, 46 *וַיִּדְעוּ כָל־הָאָרֶץ* *that all the earth may know*, i.e. all the inhabitants of the earth; cf. Deut. 9, 28. Ps. 66, 1. 96, 1. 9, &c.; Amos 1, 8 *שְׁאֵרִית* *remnant*.—(*b*) with the predicate following, Gen. 41, 57. 2 Sam. 15, 23. 1 Ki. 10, 24. Ps. 33, 8 *(כָּל־הָאָרֶץ)*; Gen. 48, 6 *מוֹלָדָת* *issue*; 1 Sam. 2, 33 *כָּל־תְּרֻמֹּת* *all the increase*; Job 30, 12 *בְּרִחָה* *rabble*. In Hag. 2, 7 read *חֲמֹלֶת* with the LXX.

Examples of predicates in the singular, notwithstanding the collective meaning of the subject, occur in Gen. 35, 11. Ex. 10, 24. 14, 10. Deut. 1, 39, &c.—For examples of bold enallage of the number in noun-clauses with a substantival predicate, see above, § 141. *c*.

Rem. Not infrequently the construction begins in the singular (especially when *g* the predicate precedes; see letter *o* below), but is carried on, after the collective

subject has been mentioned, in the plural; e.g. Ex. 1, 20 **וַיַּרְבּוּ הָעָם וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ מְאֹד** and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty; 33, 4.

- h* 3. On the other hand, plurals which have a singular meaning (§ 124. *a*) are frequently construed with the singular, especially the *pluralis excellentiae* or *maiestatis* (§ 124. *g-i*; on the union of these plurals with attributes, cf. § 132. *h*), as **אֱלֹהִים** Gen. 1, 1, 3, &c. (see, however, the Rem.), **אֲדֹנָיִם** master, Ex. 21, 4, **בָּעָלִים** master, owner, Ex. 21, 29; comp., moreover, **פְּנִים** with the singular, 2 Sam. 10, 9. Job 16, 16 *Kth*, **רַחֲמִים** Prov. 12, 10.—So feminine forms with a masculine meaning are construed with a masculine predicate, e.g. Eccles. 12, 9 **הָיָה לְהָלֵךְ חָכָם** the preacher was wise.

- i* Rem. The construction of **אֱלֹהִים** God with the plural of the predicate may be explained (apart of course from such passages as 1 Ki. 19, 2, 20, 10, where the speakers are heathen, and **אֱלֹהִים** may, therefore, be a numerical plural) partly as an acquiescence in a polytheistic form of expression, partly from the peculiar usage of one of the early documents of the Hexateuch, called *E* by Wellhausen, &c., *B* by Dillmann; comp. his commentary on Numbers—Joshua, p. 618, and above, § 124. *g*, note 2. So Gen. 20, 13 (but in conversation with a heathen); 31, 53. 35, 7, comp. also Jos. 24, 19. That this construction was afterwards studiously avoided from fear of misconception, is shown by such passages as Neh. 9, 18 compared with Ex. 32, 4, 8, and 1 Chron. 17, 21 compared with 2 Sam. 7, 23. Cf. Strack's excursus in *Die Bücher Gen. Exod. Lev. und Num.*, Munich, 1894, p. 67 sq.

- k* 4. Plurals of names of animals or things, and of abstracts, whether they be masculine or feminine, are frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate¹ (on the collective sense of the feminine form, cf. § 122. *s*); thus Joel 1, 20 **בְּהֵמוֹת שָׂדֶה תִּעְרֹג** the beasts of the field long; Jer. 12, 4 (where the predicate precedes), comp. also Job 12, 7; names of things with the predicate preceding occur in 2 Sam. 24, 13. Is. 34, 13. Jer. 4, 14. 51, 29. Ps. 18, 35. 37, 31. 73, 2 *Kth*. 103, 5. Job 14, 19. 27, 20; with the predicate following, Gen. 49, 22 (**בְּנֹת** = branches); Deut. 21, 7. 1 Sam. 4, 15 (**וַיִּרְצֵי קָקָה**)².

¹ Comp. in Greek the construction of the neuter plural with the singular of the predicate *τὰ πρὸβατα βαλὲ*; in Attic Greek the plural of the predicate is allowed only when the neuter denotes actual persons, as *τὰ ἀνδρώποδα λαβὼν*. In Arabic also the *pluralis inhumanus* (i.e. not denoting persons) is regularly construed with the feminine singular of the attribute or predicate, as are all the *plurales fracti* (collective forms).

² On the possibility of explaining forms like **קָקָה** as 3rd plural feminine, cf. above, § 44. *m*; but this explanation would not apply to all the cases under this head, cf. Joel 1, 20. Ps. 37, 31. 103, 5.

Is. 59, 12. Jer. 2, 15 *K'th.*; 4, 14. 48, 41. 49, 24. Prov. 15, 22. 20, 18. Job 20, 11. 41, 10¹.

5. Moreover, the plurals of persons (especially in the participle) *l* are sometimes construed with the singular of the predicate, when instead of the whole class of individuals, each severally is to be represented as affected by the statement. Undoubted examples of this *distributive* singular are Gen. 27, 29 (Num. 24, 9) אָרְרִיךְ אֶרְדִּי וְכָל־בָּרְכִיךְ אֶרְבֶּךָ *those that curse thee, cursed be every one of them, and those that bless thee, blessed be every one of them*; Ex. 31, 14. Lev. 17, 14 and 19, 8 (in both places the Samaritan has אִכְלוּ); Is. 3, 12 unless נִגְשִׁיו is to be regarded as a *pluralis maiestatis* according to § 124. g; Prov. 3, 18. 35 (?). 18, 21 (?). 21, 27 *b*. 27, 16. 28, 1 *b*. 28, 16 *K'th.*

Rem. Analogous to the examples above mentioned is the somewhat frequent ^m use of suffixes in the singular (distributively) referring to plurals; comp. the *verbal*-suffixes in Deut. 21, 10. 28, 48. Amos 6, 10; and the *noun*-suffixes in Is. 2, 8. 30, 22. Jer. 31, 15. Hos. 4, 8. Zech. 14, 12. Ps. 5, 10 (where, however, פִּיטוֹ is clearly to be read with all the early versions); 62, 5. 141, 10 (!). Job 38, 32. Eccles. 10, 15; finally, the suffixes with prepositions in Is. 2, 20 אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לָוֹ *which they made each one for himself*; according to others, *which they (the makers) made for him*; 5, 26. 8, 20. Job 24, 5, in each case לָוֹ; in Gen. 2, 19 לָוֹ refers to the collectives חַיָּה and עוֹף; comp. further, Is. 5, 23 כְּמִנֵּי אַחֲרֵיהֶם, and 1 Sam. 5, 10 אֵלֶי אַחֲרֵיהֶם. Conversely in Mic. 1, 11 לְבָבִי עִבְרִי לָכֵן [cf. Jer. 13, 20 *K'th.*], but the text is undoubtedly corrupt.

6. Subjects in the dual are construed with the plural of the predicate, ⁿ since verbs, adjectives, and pronouns, according to § 88. a, have no dual forms; thus עֵינַי לֵאָה רְפוּחָה Gen. 29, 17 *and Leah's eyes were dull*; 2 Sam. 24, 3. Is. 30, 20. Jer. 14, 6. Mic. 7, 10. Ps. 18, 28. 38, 11 (on the other hand, in 1 Sam. 4, 15 the predicate is in the feminine singular *after* the subject, and in Mic. 4, 11 *before* it; comp. for both, letter *k* above); so also אָזְנוֹתָם ears, 2 Chron. 6, 40; יָדֵיהֶם hands, Is. 1, 15. Job 10, 8. 20, 10 (in Ex. 17, 12 even with the plural masculine בְּרָרִים; cf. letter *p*); שְׁפָתֵיהֶם lips, 1 Sam. 1, 13. Job 27, 4; שְׁדֵיהֶם breasts, Hos. 9, 14.

7. Variations from the fundamental rule (see above, letter *a*) very ^o frequently occur *when the predicate precedes the subject* (denoting

¹ In Prov. 14, 1 an abstract plural חֲכָמוֹת (to be read thus with 9, 1, &c., instead of חֲכָמוֹת) is construed with the singular; but comp. § 124. e.

² In several of the above examples the text is doubtful, and hence Mayer Lambert (*Revue des études juives*, xxiv. 110) rejects the theory of distributive singulars generally.

animals or things¹). The speaker or writer begins with the most simple form of the predicate, the uninflected 3rd singular masculine, and leaves us without indication as to which of the following subjects (and so which gender or number) is to define the predicate thus left temporarily indefinite². Thus inflexions are omitted in—

(a) The verb, with a following singular feminine, Is. 2, 17 **וְנָחָה הָאִשָּׁה** and bowed down shall be the loftiness of man; 9, 18. 14, 11. 28, 18. 47, 11; 1 Sam. 25, 27 (see note 1 below); 1 Ki. 8, 31. 22, 36. 2 Ki. 3, 26. Jer. 51, 46. Eccles. 7, 7; with a following plural masc., Is. 13, 22 **וְנָחָה אֲרִיִּים** and there shall cry wolves, &c.; Jud. 13, 17 **וְהָיוּ מִנְּוֹתָיו** 20, 46. 1 Sam. 1, 2. 4, 10. 2 Sam. 24, 15. 1 Ki. 13, 33. Jer. 51, 48. Ps. 124, 5. Est. 9, 23 (see note 1 below); Gen. 1, 14 **וְהָיוּ מִנְּוֹתָיו** let there be lights; with a following plural feminine, Deut. 32, 35. Is. 8, 8. Jér. 13, 18. Mic. 2, 6. Ps. 57, 2; before collectives and mixed subjects, e.g. Gen. 12, 16. 13, 5. 30, 43. 32, 6, &c.; before a following dual, Is. 44, 18. Ps. 73, 7 (where, however, with the LXX **וְנָחָה** should be read).

Rem. 1. The instances in which a preceding predicate appears in the plural masculine before a plural (or collective singular) feminine of persons (Jud. 21, 21. 1 Ki. 11, 3), of animals (Gen. 30, 39) or of things (Lev. 26, 33. Jer. 13, 16. Hos. 14, 7. Ps. 16, 4. Job 3, 24. Cant. 6, 9), or before a dual (2 Sam. 4, 1. Zeph. 3, 16. Chron. 15, 7) are to be explained not on the analogy of the examples under letter *o*, but from a dislike of using the 3rd plur. fem. imperf. (for this is the only form concerned in the above examples; comp., however, Nah. 3, 11 **וְהָיוּ** instead of **וְהָיוּ**); comp. the examples of a following predicate in the 3rd plur. masc., instead of the fem., under letters *t* and *u*, and on an analogous phenomenon in the imperative, see § 110. *k*.

2. As in the case of verbs proper so also the verb **וְהָיוּ**, when used as a copula, frequently remains uninflected before the subject; comp. Gen. 5, 23 **וְהָיוּ** 39, 5. Deut. 21, 3 (according to the accents); 22, 23. Is. 18, 5 **וְהָיוּ** and a ripening grape the flower becometh.

(b) The adjective in a noun-clause, e.g. Ps. 119, 137 **יָשָׁר כְּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ** upright are thy judgements; comp. verse 155³. In German also the adjective as predicate remains uninflected.—On the other hand,

¹ Only rarely does an uninflected predicate precede a personal subject, as 1 Sam. 25, 27 (but **וְהָיוּ** should probably be read, as in verse 35); Est. 9, 23 (before a plur. masc.). Such examples as Job 42, 15 are to be explained according to § 121. *a*.

² In a certain sense this is analogous to the German *es kommt ein Mann, eine Frau*, &c.

³ This does not include such cases as Job 24, 7. 10, where **וְהָיוּ** is rather to be explained as an accusative denoting a state, § 118. *n*.

רָעָה in עֲבָדֶיךָ רָעָה *thy servants are shepherds*, Gen. 47, 3, is either an unusual orthography or simply a misspelling for רָעָה.

Rem. 1. As soon as a sentence which begins with an uninflected predicate is carried on after the mention of the subject, the gender and number of the subsequent (co-ordinate) predicates must coincide with those of the subject, e.g. Gen. 1, 14 וְהָיוּ . . . יְהִי מְאֹרֹת (see letter *o* above); Num. 9, 6. Ezek. 14, 1; comp. also Gen. 30, 39 (see letter *p* above).

2. The dislike mentioned in letter *p* above, of using the feminine form (comp., further, § 144. *a*, with the sections of the Grammar referred to there, and below, letter *u*), is exemplified sometimes by the fact that of several predicates only that which stands next to the feminine substantive is inflected as feminine; thus in Is. 14, 9 רָנְנוּהָ, and afterwards עֲוִירָהּ; 33, 9 אֲבָל אֲמַלְלָהָ אֶרֶץ *mourneth, languisheth the land*. Comp. Jer. 4, 30, and the examples (§ 47. *b*) where only the earlier of several consecutive forms of the 2nd sing. fem. imperf. are provided with the affirmative *f*, Is. 57, 8. Jer. 3, 5. Ezek. 22, 4. 23, 32 (תִּשְׁתָּי after תִּהְיֶה); on the converse sequence of genders in imperatives, Nah. 3, 15, comp. § 110. *k*.—Of a different kind are instances like Lev. 2, 1, 5, 1. 20, 6, where נָפֶשׁ *person* (fem.) as the narrative continues, assumes (in agreement with the context) the sense of a masculine person.

3. The instances in which the gender or number of the *following* predicate appears to differ from that of the subject, are due partly to manifest errors in the text, e.g. Gen. 32, 9 read with the Samaritan הִמָּחֵר instead of הִמָּחֵת וְהָיָה then follows correctly; 1 Sam. 2, 20 read with Wellhausen שָׁאֵל, according to 1, 28, instead of שָׁאֵל; 1 Sam. 16, 4 read וַיִּאֲמָרוּ; 2 Sam. 14, 10 read וַתִּבְאֶתוּ; Ezek. 18, 29 instead of יִתְכַּן read the plural as in verse 25; so also Ezek. 20, 38 for יִבְאוּ, and in Job 6, 20 for בָּטָחוּ; in Lam. 5, 10 read נִכְסָרוּ, and comp. in general, § 7. *d*, note 2; 1 Chron. 2, 48 read יִלְדָהּ; in Jer. 48, 15 the text is certainly corrupt. Other instances are due to special reasons. The variations in Is. 49, 11. Hos. 14, 1. Prov. 1, 16 (after רִנְּנוּ), Ps. 11, 4 (after עֲיִינוּ), Prov. 5, 2, 10, 21. 32. 18, 6. 26, 23. Job 15, 6 (all after שָׁפְטִים), Prov. 3, 2 (after מִצֻּרֹתֵי), Ps. 102, 28. Job 16, 22 (after שָׁנֹחַ), Dan. 11, 41 (read וַיִּבְנוּ), and perhaps Gen. 20, 17 are also to be explained (see letter *p*) from the dislike of the 3rd plur. fem. imperf.; moreover, in Jer. 44, 19. Prov. 26, 23 even the plur. masc. of a participle occurs instead of the plur. fem.—In Gen. 31, 8 sq. וְהָיָה, after a plural subject, is explained as a case of attraction to the following singular predicate¹.—In Gen. 4, 7 רֹחֵץ is a substantival participle (*a lurker, a coucher*). In Gen. 47, 24 וְהָיָה remains undefined in gender (masc.), although the noun precedes for the sake of emphasis; so also in Ex. 12, 49. 28, 7. 32. Num. 9, 14. 15, 29. Jer. 50, 46. Eccles. 2, 7 וְהָיוּ לִי as if the sentence began *afresh, and servants born in my*

¹ יִבְאוּ probably an error for יִבְאוּ. The Masora on Lev. 11, 34 reckons fourteen instances of יִבְאוּ, where we should expect the plural.

² So also the pronoun הוּא emphatically resuming the subject (see § 141. *b*) is attracted to the predicate in number in Jos. 13, 14 הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ . . . וְהָיוּ אֲשֵׁי יְהוָה *the offerings of the Lord . . . that is his inheritance*; in number and gender, Lev. 25, 33 *Q'el*; Jer. 10, 3.

house . . . there fell to my lot this possession also).—In Job 20, 26 לֹא־נִפְחָה may (unless נִפְחָה is regarded as masculine, § 122. o) be taken impersonally, *fire, without its being blown* upon it.—In Is. 16, 8 and Hab. 3, 17 the predicate in the singular is explained from the collective character of שְׂדֵמֹת (see letter *h* above); on the other hand, the masculine form of the predicate is abnormal in Ps. 87, 3. Prov. 2, 10. 12, 25. 29, 25. Job 8, 7.

§ 146. Construction of Compound Subjects.

a 1. When the subject is composed of a nomen regens (in the construct state) with a following genitive, the predicate sometimes agrees in gender and number not with the nomen regens, but with the genitive, when this represents the principal idea of the compound subject¹. Thus 1 Sam. 2, 4 קֶשֶׁת גִּבּוֹרִים חָצִים *the bow of the mighty men is broken*, as if it were *the mighty men with their bow are broken*; Ex. 26, 12. Lev. 13, 9. 1 Ki. 1, 41. 17, 16. Is. 2, 11. 21, 17. Job 15, 20. 21, 21. 29, 10. 32, 7 (שָׁנִים רַב equivalent to *many years*); 38, 21; with the predicate preceding, 2 Sam. 10, 9, unless it is to be explained according to § 145. k.

b Rem. 1. The cases in which קוֹל (*voice, sound*) with a following genitive stands at the beginning of a sentence, apparently in this construction, are really of a different kind. The קוֹל is there to be taken as an exclamation, and the supposed predicate as in apposition to the genitive, e.g. Gen. 4, 10 *the voice of thy brother's blood, which crieth* (prop. as *crying*, § 108. p) . . . ! = *hark! thy brother's blood is crying*, &c.; Lev. 13, 9. Is. 13, 4. 66, 6. In Is. 52, 8 an independent verbal-clause follows the exclamation *the voice of thy watchmen!* in Jer. 10, 22 and Cant. 2, 8 an independent noun-clause; in Is. 40, 3 קוֹל קָרָא *the voice of one that crieth!* i. e. *hark! there is one crying* is followed immediately by the direct discourse; in Mic. 6, 9 קוֹל *hark!* may be used disconnectedly (cf. the almost adverbial use of קוֹל in § 144. m) and יְהוָה be taken as the subject to יִקְרָא.

c 2. When the substantive כֹּל (כָּל-) *entirety* is used in connexion with a genitive as subject of the sentence, the predicate usually agrees in gender and number with the genitive, since כֹּל is equivalent in sense to an attribute (*whole, all*) of the genitive; hence, e.g. with the predicate preceding, Gen. 5, 5 יְהוָה כָּל־יְמֵי אָדָם *and all the days of Adam were*, &c. (in 9, 29 יְהוָה; but the Samaritan reads יְהוָה here also); Ex. 15, 20; with the predicate following, Ps. 150, 6 and elsewhere. Exceptions are, e.g. Lev. 17, 14 (but cf. § 145. l). Is. 64, 10. Prov. 16, 2. Nah. 3, 7. On the other hand, in such cases as Ex. 12, 16 the agreement of the predicate with כֹּל is explained from the stress laid upon the latter, כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא being equivalent to *nothing at all of work*.

¹ Sometimes, however, the attraction of the predicate to the genitive may be merely due to juxtaposition.

2. When the subject of the sentence consists of several nouns *d* connected by *wāw copulative*, usually

(a) The predicate *following* is put in the plural, e.g. Gen. 8, 22 *seed time and harvest, and cold and heat . . . shall not cease* (לֹא יִשְׁכַּח); after subjects of different genders in the masculine (as the *prior gender*, cf. § 132. d), e.g. Gen. 18, 11 אֲבִרָהָם וְשָׂרָה זָקֵנִים *Abraham and Sarah were old*; Deut. 28, 32. 1 Ki. 1, 21.

Rem. Rare exceptions are Prov. 27, 9 שֶׁמֶן וְקִטְרוֹת יִסְמְחוּ לֵב יִסְמַח לֵב *ointment and e perfume rejoice the heart*, where the predicate agrees in gender with the masculine שֶׁמֶן; on the other hand, in Ex. 21, 4 (where הָאִשָּׁה וְהָלֵוִי are the subjects) it agrees with הָאִשָּׁה as being the principal person; in the compound sentence, Is. 9, 4, it agrees with the feminine subject immediately preceding¹.

(b) The predicate *preceding* two or more subjects may likewise *f* be used in the plural (Gen. 40, 1. Job 3, 5 and elsewhere); not infrequently, however, it agrees in gender and number with the first, as being the subject nearest to it. Thus the predicate is put in the singular masculine before several masculines singular in Gen. 9, 23. 11, 29. 21, 32. 24, 50. 34, 20. Jud. 14, 5; before a masculine and a feminine singular, e.g. Gen. 3, 8. 24, 55 *then said* (וַיֹּאמֶר) *her brother and her mother*; 33, 7; before a masculine singular and a plural, e.g. Gen. 7, 7 וַיָּבֹא נֹחַ וּבָנָיו *and Noah went in, and his sons, &c.*; Gen. 8, 18 (where feminines plural also follow); 44, 14. Ex. 15, 1. 2 Sam. 5, 21; before collectives feminine and masculine, 2 Sam. 12, 2.

Similarly, the feminine singular occurs before several feminines *g* singular, e.g. Gen. 31, 14 וְלֵאָה וְרָחֵל *then answered Rachel and Leah*; before a feminine singular and a feminine plural, e.g. Gen. 24, 61; before a feminine singular and a masculine singular, Num. 12, 1 וְמִרְיָם וְאַהֲרֹן *then spake Miriam and Aaron*; Jud. 5, 1; before a feminine singular and a masculine plural, e.g. Gen. 33, 7 (comp., on the other hand, Ps. 75, 4 וְכָל יֹשְׁבֵיהָ *dissolved are the earth and all the inhabitants thereof*). The plural feminine occurs before a plural feminine and a plural masculine in Amos 8, 13.—In Jer. 44, 25 for אִתָּם וְיִשְׁכָּם read אִתָּם הַנָּשִׁים with the LXX, and cf. verse 19.

(c) When other predicates follow after the subjects have been *h* mentioned, they are necessarily put in the plural; comp. Ex. 21, 32. 24, 61. 31, 4. 33, 7, &c., and § 145. s.

¹ Similarly with a mixed object, Gen. 33, 2 *he put . . . Leah and her children after*; אַחֲרֵיהֶם agrees with the masculine immediately preceding.

§ 147. *Incomplete Sentences.*

- a* 1. Sentences are called *incomplete*, in which either the subject or the predicate or both must in some way be supplied from the context¹. Besides the instances enumerated in § 116. *s* (omission of the personal pronoun when subject of a participial clause) and the periphrases for negative attributes § 152. *u*, this description includes certain (noun-) clauses introduced by הִנֵּה (see letter *b* below), and also a number of exclamations of the most varied kinds (see letter *c* below).
- b* 2. The demonstrative particle הִנֵּה, *en, ecce* may be used either absolutely (as a kind of interjection, comp. § 105. *b*) before complete noun- or verbal-clauses, e.g. Gen. 28, 15 וְהִנֵּה אֲנִכִּי עִמָּךְ *and, behold! I am with thee*; 37, 7. 48, 21. Ex. 3, 13. 34, 10, or may take the pronoun, which would be the natural subject of a noun-clause, in the form of a suffix, see § 100. *o*. Whether these suffixes are to be regarded as in the accusative has been shown to be doubtful in § 100. *p*. However, in the case of הִנֵּה the analogy of the corresponding Arabic demonstrative particle 'inna (followed by an accusative of the noun) is significant². If הִנֵּה with a suffix and a following adjective or participle (see the examples in § 116. *p* and *q*) forms a noun-clause, the subject proper, to which הִנֵּה with the suffix refers, must, strictly speaking, be supplied again before the predicate³. Sometimes, however, the pronoun referring to the subject is wanting, and the simple הִנֵּה takes the place of the subject and copula (as Gen. 18, 9 וְהִנֵּה הָיְתָה בָאֵהָל *behold she is in the tent*; 42, 28), or there is no indication whatever of the predicate, so that the sentence is limited to הִנֵּה with the suffix, as in the frequent use of הִנֵּנִי, הִנֵּנִי *here am I*, in answer to

¹ This does not apply to such cases as Gen. 33, 8, where an infinitive with ל appears alone in answer to a question, the substance of the question being presupposed as a main clause; comp. also Gen. 26, 7, where הִיא must again be supplied after אֲשֶׁרֶּהּ.

² On the same analogy any substantive following הִנֵּה would have to be regarded as originally a virtual accusative. Since, however, Hebrew does not possess case-terminations (as the Arabic does, and uses the accusative necessarily after 'inna), it is very doubtful whether, and how far, substantives following הִנֵּה were felt to be accusatives.

³ That these are real noun-clauses and that the participle (e.g. הִנֵּה מֵת in מֵת Gen. 20, 3) cannot be taken as a second accusative (something like *ecce te moriturum*), is also shown by the analogy of Arabic, where after 'inna with an accusative the predicate is expressly in the *nominative*.

an address. Elsewhere a substantive follows הִנֵּה (or הִנֵּן Gen. 11, 6. Job 31, 35), and הִנֵּה then includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun and the copula, e.g. Gen. 22, 7 וְהָעֵצִים הָאֵלֶּשׁ הִנֵּה here is the fire and the wood, &c.; 12, 19 behold thou hast thy wife! Ex. 24, 8; with reference to the past, e.g. Amos 7, 1 וְהִנֵּה לְקֶשֶׁת ת' and, lo, it was the latter growth, &c. By a very pregnant construction the simple הִנֵּה is used as the equivalent of a sentence in Job 9, 19 lo, here am I!

3. Examples of exclamations (threatening, complaining, triumphing, especially warlike or seditious) in which, owing to the excitement of the speaker, some indispensable member of the sentence is suppressed, are—(a) with suppression of the predicate (which has frequently to be supplied in the form of a jussive), e.g. Jud. 7, 20 a sword for the Lord and for Gideon! (verse 18 without הִתְרַב); 2 Sam. 20, 1 and 2 Chron. 10, 16 (comp. also 1 Ki. 22, 36) every man to his tents, O Israel! (i.e. let every man go to or remain in his tent); the same exclamation without אִישׁ 1 Ki. 12, 16; moreover, Is. 1, 28. 13, 4 (on the exclamatory קול equivalent to hark! cf. § 146. b); 28, 10. 29, 16 הַפְּקִיכִים O your perversity! i.e. how great it is!); Jer. 49, 16 (if הַמְּלָכִית be equivalent to terror be upon thee!); Joel 4, 14. Mal. 1, 13 הִנֵּה סִתְלָאָה behold what a weariness!); Job 22, 29; perhaps also Gen. 49, 4 בִּפְתִּיחַ a bubbling over as water (sc. happened), unless it is better to supply a subject אַתָּה (thou wast).—(b) With suppression of the subject, Job 15, 23 אֵיפֹה where sc. is bread?—(c) With suppression of both subject and predicate, Jud. 7, 18 (see above); 1 Ki. 12, 16 (see above); 2 Ki. 9, 27 אֲתוּ גַם him also! explained immediately afterwards by הִפְרֵו smile him! Hos. 5, 8 after thee, Benjamin! sc. is the enemy (differently in Jud. 5, 14); Ps. 6, 4. 90, 13. Hab. 2, 6 עֲרִיטָי; Ps. 74, 9 עֲרִיטָה.—On וְלֹא and if not, 2 Sam. 13, 26. 2 Ki. 5, 17, see § 159. dd.

Rem. 1. To the class of incomplete sentences naturally belong exclamations introduced by interjections אֵיפֹה, אֵי, הוּי, הֵם¹; comp. § 105. The object of the threat or imprecation (with אֵי) follows regularly (except Ezek. 24, 6. 9) with ל (comp. vae tibi), e.g. וְאֵי לָנוּ woe unto us! 1 Sam. 4, 8. Is. 6, 5; on the other hand, the object of commiseration (with הוּי) follows mostly in the vocative, or rather in the accusative of exclamation (comp. vae te in Plautus); so in lamentation for the dead, הוּי אָחִי alas, my brother! 1 Ki. 13, 30. Jer. 22, 18; הוּי גּוֹי חַטָּא ah sinful nation!

¹ We do not consider here the cases in which these interjections (e.g. הֵם Jud. 3, 19. Amos 6, 10) stand quite disconnectedly (so always אָחִי and אָחָה).

- Is. 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 18, 20, 22, &c. (with **אֵל** Jer. 48, 1; **עַל** 50, 27. Ezek. 13, 3; **לֵךְ** Ezek. 13, 18). **אֵלֶּה** occurs in the expression (**וְהָיָה**) **יְהוָה אֵלֶּה אֲדָנִי** Jos. 7, 7, &c. (10 times); and in **לֵינָם אֵלֶּה** *alas for the day!* Joel 1, 15. For **דִּן** comp. Hab. 2, 20. Zeph. 1, 7. Zech. 2, 17 absolutely, Jud. 3, 19. Am. 6, 10, 8, 3.
- e* 2. Finally, instances of noun-clauses shortened in an unusual manner may perhaps occur in **וְיָדֵיהֶם** and **רַגְלֵיהֶם** Ps. 115, 7, for **לָהֶם יָדִים** *they have hands*, &c.; comp. verses 5 and 6 **פְּתוּ-לָהֶם**, &c. Perhaps also **וְאֵילָנֶיךָ** Gen. 22, 24, and **וְדָלִיךָ** Eccles. 5, 16 (but hardly **נְבִיאֲכֶם** Num. 12, 6; cf. § 128. *d* above) are to be regarded in the same way.

II. Special Kinds of Sentences.

§ 148. Exclamations.

- a* The originally interrogative **מָה** is used to introduce exclamations expressing wonder or indignation = *O how!* or ridicule, *why! how!* sometimes strengthened by **וְהָיָה** or **וְהָיָה** according to § 136. *c*.—Astonishment or indignation at something which has happened is introduced by **מָה** *how* (likewise originally interrogative) with the perfect; the indignant refusal of a demand by **מָה** (but also by **מָה** Job 31, 1) with the imperfect; an exclamation of lamentation by **מָה**, less frequently **מָה** *how!* in Joel 1, 18 by **מָה**.

Examples:—

- b* **מָה** (or **מָה** with a following *Dageš*, see § 37) expressing admiration (or astonishment) before verbal-clauses, e.g. Gen. 27, 20 (**מָה-זֶה**); 38, 29. Num. 24, 5 (*how goodly are . . .*); Cant. 7, 2; before the predicate of noun-clauses, e.g. Gen. 28, 17. Ps. 8, 2; mockingly before the verb, 2 Sam. 6, 20 (*how glorious was . . .*); Jer. 22, 23. Job 26, 2 sq.; indignantly, Gen. 3, 13 **מָה-זֶה**; 4, 10, 20, 9, 31, 26 *what hast thou done!*
- מָה** with the perfect, e.g. Gen. 26, 9. Ps. 73, 19; in scornful exclamation, Is. 14, 4, 12; in a lament (usually **מָה-זֶה**), 2 Sam. 1, 25, 27; with the imperfect, in a reproachful question, Gen. 39, 9, 44, 8. Ps. 11, 1, 137, 4; in a mocking imitation of lament, Mic. 2, 4.
- מָה** with the perfect, Is. 1, 21. Lam. 1, 1; with the imperfect, Lam. 2, 1, 4, 1.
- c* Rem. 1. The close relation between a question and an exclamation appears also in the interrogative personal pronoun **מִי** in such cases as Mic. 7, 18 **מִי-אֵל כְּמוֹךָ** *who is a God like unto thee?* and so in general in *rhetorical* questions as the expression of a forcible denial; similarly in the use of an interrogative sentence to express a wish, see § 151. *a*.
- d* 2. A weaker form of exclamation is sometimes produced by the insertion of a corroborative **כִּי** *verily, surely*, before the predicate, Gen. 18, 20; comp. 33, 11. Is. 7, 9, and the analogous cases in the apodoses of conditional sentences, § 159. *cc*.

§ 149. *Sentences which express an Oath or Asseveration.*

The particle **אִם**, in the sense of *certainly not*, and **אִם־לֹא** (rarely **כִּי** *a* Gen. 22, 16) in the sense of *certainly*, are used to introduce promises or threats confirmed by an oath (especially after such formulae as **חַי־יְהוָה**, **חַי־נַפְשִׁי**, **חַי־אֲנִי**, **כִּי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי**, **חַי־אֲנִי**, &c., as well as after imprecations, see below), and also simple asseverations, e.g. 2 Sam. 20, 20. Job 27, 5 after **לִי חֲלִילָה** *far be it from me*, but mostly without any introductory formula.

Rem. No certain explanation of these particles has yet been given. According *b* to the usual view, phrases expressing an oath depend on the suppression of an imprecation upon oneself, e.g. *the Lord do so unto me, if I do it* equivalent to *I certainly will not do it*; then naturally **אִם־לֹא** properly *if I do it not* equivalent to *I certainly will do it*. It is indeed difficult to understand such self-imprecations spoken by Yahweh, as in Deut. 1, 34 sq. Is. 14, 24. 22, 14. Jer. 22, 6. Ezek. 3, 6. 35, 6. Ps. 95, 11. Possibly, however, the consciousness of the real meaning of the formula was lost at an early period, and **אִם־לֹא** simply came to express *verily*, **אִם** *verily not*.—In 1 Sam. 25, 22, where, instead of a self-imprecation, a curse is pronounced upon others, read **לְדָוִד** with the LXX for **לְאִיבֵי דָוִד**.

Examples:—

(a) The particles **אִם** and **אִם־לֹא** used after the utterance of an oath and after *c* formulae of swearing, e.g. 2 Sam. 11, 11 (see note on letter a) **חַי־יְהוָה** **חַי־נַפְשִׁי** **אִם־אֶעֱשֶׂה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה** *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth, I will not do this thing*; 1 Sam. 14, 45. 2 Ki. 5, 16 (after **חַי־יְהוָה**; in 1 Sam. 14, 39 and 28, 6 **חַי־יְהוָה** is followed by a simple **כִּי**); Cant. 2, 7. 3, 5 (after **הִשְׁבַּעְתִּי** *I adjure you*); comp. also Gen. 14, 23. 21, 23. 26, 29; spoken by Yahweh, Deut. 1, 34 sq. 1 Sam. 3, 14. Ps. 95, 11; similarly **אִם־לֹא** Gen. 24, 37 sq.; spoken by Yahweh, Is. 14, 24, where **אִם־לֹא** occurs first with the perfect in the sense of a prophetic perfect, § 106. *z*, but in the parallel clause with the imperfect; Jer. 22, 6; in Gen. 31, 52 the negative oath introduced by **אִם־אֶתָּה** **אִם־אֲנִי** is immediately afterwards continued by **לֹא** with the imperfect.—In Ezek. 34, 10 the threat introduced in verse 8 by **אִם־לֹא** is, after a long parenthesis, resumed with **וְהָנִי**.

(b) **אִם** and **אִם־לֹא** after formulae of cursing, e.g. 1 Sam. 3, 17 **יִסְתֹּר לְךָ נְאֻם יְהוָה** *God do so to thee, and more also! thou shalt not hide anything from me, &c.*; comp. 1 Sam. 25, 22. On the other hand, **כִּי** introduces the facts sworn to, in 1 Sam. 14, 44. 1 Ki. 2, 23 (here with a perfect), and in 2 Sam. 3, 35 **אִם** **כִּי**; in 1 Sam. 25, 34 the preceding **כִּי** is repeated before **אִם**; in 1 Sam. 20, 13 the purport of the asseveration is repeated (after the insertion of a conditional sentence) in the perfect consecutive.

¹ Also combined **חַי־יְהוָה** **חַי־נַפְשִׁי** 1 Sam. 20, 3. 25, 26 *as the Lord liveth, and as thy soul (i. e. thou) liveth!* (Also in 2 Sam. 11, 11 read **חַי־יְהוָה** instead of the impossible **חַיִּי**). On **חַי** and **חַיִּי** in these noun-clauses (prop. *living is the Lord, &c.*), cf. § 93. *aa*, note.

- c (c) **DN** and **לֹא־DN** as simple particles of asseveration, e.g. Jud. 5, 8 **אֵין דָּם וְיָרֵיחַ וְיֶסֶד וְיִסְדָּהּ** *truly, there was not a shield and spear seen, &c.*; Is. 22, 14. Job 6, 28 (in the middle of the sentence); after **וְיָלִיךָ** *absit*, twice repeated, 2 Sam. 20, 20; **לֹא־DN** with the perfect, Job 22, 20.

§ 150. Interrogative Sentences.

- a 1. A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently the natural emphasis upon the words (especially when the most emphatic word is placed at the beginning of the sentence) is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such; comp. Gen. 27, 24 **אַתָּה הָאָדָם בְּנִי עֵשָׂו** *thou art my son Esau?* Gen. 18, 12. Ex. 33, 14 (**בְּעִנִּי**); 1 Sam. 11, 12 **שָׂאֵל יִסְלַף עָלֵינוּ** *Saul shall reign over us?* 1 Sam. 22, 7. 2 Sam. 16, 17. 18, 29 **שְׁלוֹם לַנָּעַר** *is it well with the young man?* 1 Sam. 16, 4. 1 Ki. 1, 24. Zech. 8, 6 (*should it also be marvellous in mine eyes?*). So especially, when the interrogative clause is connected with a preceding sentence by **וְ**, e.g. Jon. 4, 11 **וְאֵינִי לֹא אֲחֻזָּם** *and I should not have pity?* Ex. 8, 22 *will they not stone us?* Jud. 11, 23. 14, 16. 1 Sam. 20, 9. 24, 20. 25, 11. 2 Sam. 11, 11. Is. 37, 11. Jer. 25, 29. 45, 5. 49, 12. Ezek. 20, 31. Job 2, 10. 10, 9; or when (as in some of the examples just given) it is negative (with **לֹא** for **לֹא־הִיא** *nonne?*), e.g. 2 Sam. 23, 5 **בְּיָמָיו לֹא־יִצְמַח** *verily will he not make it to grow?* 2 Ki. 5, 26. Lam. 3, 38¹.

- b Rem. The omission of the interrogative particle (**הֲ**, **הִי**) occurs especially before a following guttural for the sake of euphony (comp. § 126. s); thus before **נ**, Gen. 18, 12. 27, 24. 1 Sam. 30, 8. 1 Ki. 1, 24. 21, 7. Job 14, 3 (as Dan. 5, 13 in Aramaic); before **ה**, 1 Sam. 22, 15. 2 Sam. 19, 23. Hab. 2, 19. Job 38, 18; before **ח**, 1 Sam. 21, 16; before **ע**, Gen. 19, 12. Ex. 9, 17. Job 2, 9; but comp. also Job 37, 18 and 39, 2 (before **ה**); 40, 30 (before **י**).

- c 2. As a rule, however, the simple question is introduced by *He interrogative* **הֲ** (**הִי**; as to its form, cf. § 100. k-n) *ne?* *num?* the disjunctive question by **הֲ** (*num? utrum?*) in the first clause, and **DN** (also **DNִי**, less frequently **אָנִי**) *an?* in the second², e.g. 1 Ki. 22, 15 **נִחַדְנָה אִם . . . נִחַלְנָה** *shall we go . . . or shall we forbear?*

¹ But in 1 Sam. 27, 10 instead of **אֵלֵךְ** (which according to the usual explanation would expect a negative answer) read either **אֵלֵךְ־נִי** (**עָלֵךְ־נִי**) with the LXX, or better, **אֵלֵךְ־נָה** (**הֵנָּה**) *whither*, with the Targum.

² Quite exceptional is the use of the particle **אֵין** *num?* (common in Aramaic) in 1 Sam. 21, 9 **אֵין יִשְׁפֹּחַ אֵין** *num est hic?* The text is, however, undoubtedly

The particular uses are as follows :—

(a) The particle *הֲ* stands primarily before the simple question, when the questioner is wholly uncertain as to the answer to be expected, and may be used either before noun-clauses, e. g. Gen. 43, 7 *הֲיֵשׁ לָכֶם אָח* *is your father yet alive? have ye another brother?* for *הֲיֵשׁ* comp. Gen. 24, 23. 1 Sam. 9, 11; for *הֲכִי* *is it that?* Job 6, 22; for *הֲכִי יֵשׁ* *is there yet?* 2 Sam. 9, 1 (but in 2 Sam. 23, 19 for *הֲכִי* read *הֲנֹה* with 1 Chron. 11, 25); for *הֲאֵין* *is there not?* 1 Ki. 22, 7 and elsewhere; or before verbal-clauses, e. g. Job 2, 3 *הֲשִׁקְפָה* *hast thou considered* (*הַשְׁמַתָּ לְבָבִי*) *my servant Job?* In other cases *הֲ* (equivalent to *num?*) is used before questions, to which, from their tone and contents, a negative answer is expected, e. g. Job 14, 14 *הֲיִחְיֶה* *shall he indeed live again?* Sometimes a question is so used only as a rhetorical form instead of a negative assertion, or of a surprised or indignant refusal⁴, e. g. 2 Sam. 7, 5 *הֲאֵתָה תִּבְנֶה לִי בַּיִת* *shalt thou build me an house?* (in the parallel passage 1 Chron. 17, 4 *לֹא אֵתָה וְג'* *thou shalt not, &c.*); Gen. 4, 9 *הֲשֹׁמֵר אָחִי אֲבִי* *am I my brother's keeper?* comp. 2 Ki. 5, 7, and the two passages where *הֲ* is used before the infinitive (*constr.* Job 34, 18, *absol.* Job 40, 2; comp. for both, § 113. *ee*, with the note).—On the other hand, in 1 Ki. 16, 31 for *הֲנִקֵּל* (after *וַיְהִי*) read *הִנֵּקֵל*.

Rem. 1. A few passages deserve special mention, in which the use of the interrogative is altogether different from our idiom, since it serves merely to express the conviction that the contents of the statement are well known to the hearer, and are unconditionally admitted by him. Thus, Gen. 27, 36 *הֲכִי קָרָא* *prop. is it so that one names? &c.*, equivalent to *of a truth he is rightly named Jacob*; Gen. 29, 15 *וְעֵתָה אָנֹכִי* *verily thou art my brother*; 1 Sam. 2, 27 *וְעַתָּה אָנֹכִי* *I did indeed, &c.*; 1 Ki. 22, 3 *וְעַתָּה אָנֹכִי* *ye know surely . . .*; Job 20, 4.—In 1 Sam. 23, 19 (comp. Ps. 54, 2) a surprising communication is introduced in this way (by *הֲלֹא*) in order to show it to be absolutely true, and in Amos 9, 7 a concession is expressed by *הֲלֹא* *I have, it is true, &c.* Finally, we may include the formula of quotation *הֲלֹא הִיא* *Jos. 10, 13* or *כִּתְּבוּבִים הֲלֹא-הֵם* *equivalent to surely it is, they are written* (the latter in 1 Ki. 11, 41. 14, 29, and very often elsewhere in the Books of Kings and Chronicles), synonymous with the simple formula of assertion *הִנֵּה כִּתְּבוּבִים* 2 Sam. 1, 18, and *הֵנָּה כִּתְּבוּבִים* 1 Ki. 14, 19. 2 Ki. 15, 11. 2 Chron. 27, 7. 32, 32.

corrupt; according to Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Sam.*, the LXX express the reading *וְעַתָּה הִיא*.—The above does not apply to interrogative sentences introduced by interrogative pronouns (§ 37) or by the interrogatives compounded with *מָה* *what?* such as *מָה בְּפֶה* *how many?* *מָה לָּמָד* *why?* (see § 102. *k*). *מָה מִדָּע* *why?* (§ 99. *e*), or by *אֵימָה* *where?* *אֵימָה אֵיכָה* *how?* (§ 148. *&c.* On the transformation of pronouns and adverbs into interrogative words by means of a prefixed *מֵ*, see the Lexicon.

³ On the use of the *imperfect* in deliberative questions, see § 107. *t*; on the so-called *perfectum confidentiae* in interrogative sentences, see § 106. *n*.

⁴ Analogous to this is the use of the interrogative *מָה* in the sense of a reproachful remonstrance instead of a prohibition, as Cant. 8, 4 *מָה-תִּעְרִירֵי* *why should ye stir up?* comp. also Job 31, 1; see above, § 148.

Of very frequent occurrence also are questions introduced by מַה־ , which really contain an affirmation and are used to state the reason for a request or warning, e.g. 2 Sam. 2, 22 *turn thee aside . . . wherefore should I smite thee to the ground? i. e. otherwise I will (or must) smite, &c.*; cf. 1 Sam. 19, 17, and Driver on the passage; 2 Chron. 25, 16; also Gen. 27, 45. Ex. 32, 12 (Joel 2, 17. Ps. 79, 10. 115, 2); Cant. 1, 7. Eccles. 5, 5. 7, 17. Dan. 1, 10.

f 2. The rare cases in which a *simple* question is introduced by אִם (as sometimes in Latin by *an? is it?*) are really due to the suppression of the first member of a double question; thus 1 Ki. 1, 27. Isa. 29, 16. Job 6, 12. 39, 13.

g (b) Disjunctive questions are, as a rule, introduced by אִם—וְ (*utrum—an?*) or sometimes by אִם־וְ , e.g. Joel 1, 2. Job 21, 4 (even with וְ repeated after אִם־וְ in a question which implies disbelief, Gen. 17, 17). In Job 34, 17. 40, 8 sq. special emphasis is given to the first member by הֲאִם־וְ prop. *is it even?* The second member is introduced by וְאִם or in Job 16, 3. 38, 28. 31. 36, in each case before וְ , and hence no doubt for euphonic reasons, to avoid the combination וְ אִם .

h Double questions with (אִם־וְ) אִם—וְ need not always be mutually exclusive; frequently the disjunctive form serves (especially in poetic parallelism; but comp. also e.g. Gen. 37, 8) merely to repeat the same question in different words, and thus to express it more emphatically. So Job 4, 17 *shall mortal man be just before God? or (אִם) shall a man be pure before his Maker?* Job 6, 5 sq. 8, 3. 10, 4 sq. 11, 2. 7. 22, 3. Isa. 10, 15. Jer. 5, 29. The second member may, therefore, just as well be connected by a simple וְ , e.g. Job 13, 7. 15, 7 sq. 38, 16 sq. 22. 32. 39; comp. also Ps. 8, 5 after וְאִם־וְ ; Job 21, 17 sq. after וְאִם־וְ ; or even without a conjunction, Job 8, 11. 22, 4; after וְאִם־וְ Ps. 144, 3.

i (c) With regard to *indirect* questions² after verbs of inquiring, doubting, examining³, &c., simple questions of this kind take either הֲ *whether*, Gen. 8, 8⁴, or אִם Gen. 15, 5. 2 Ki. 1, 2. Cant. 7, 13; even before a noun-clause, Jer. 5, 1; in 1 Sam. 20, 10 the indirect question is introduced by אִם־וְ , i. e. *probably if per-*

¹ אִם־וְ occurs in Prov. 27, 24 after a negative statement; we should, however, with Dyserinck read אִם־וְ . Not less irregular is אִם־וְ instead of אִם־וְ אִם־וְ in the second clause of Jud. 14, 15, but the text can hardly be correct (comp. Moore, *Judges*, New York, 1895, p. 337); in 1 Sam. 23, 11 the second וְ introduces a fresh question which is only loosely connected with the first.—In Num. 17, 28 and in the third clause of Job 6, 13, אִם־וְ is best taken with Ewald in the sense of אִם־וְ , since אִם־וְ from its use in oaths (see above, § 149. d) may simply mean *verily not*.

² It should here be remarked that the distinction between direct and indirect questions cannot have been recognized by the Hebrew mind to the same extent as it is in Latin or English. In Hebrew there is no difference between the two kinds of sentence, either as regards mood (as in Latin) or in tense and position of the words (as in English). Comp. also § 137. c.

³ In Gen. 43, 6 the וְ after וְהַיִּזְיִר is explained from the fact that the latter, according to the context, implies to *give information upon a question*.

⁴ Also in Eccles. 3, 21 we should read וְהֵלֵךְ וְהֵלֵךְ and וְהֵלֵךְ וְהֵלֵךְ (*whether—whether*) instead of the article which is assumed by the Masora.

chance. In disjunctives (*whether—or*) אִם—וְ Num. 13, 18 at the end (or אִם—וְ Gen. 24, 21. 27, 21. 37, 22. Ex. 16, 4), and וְ—אִם Num. 13, 18, which is followed by אִם—וְ ; also אִם—וְ Eccles. 2, 19. The formula $\text{אִם יוֹדַעְתִּי מִי}$ has an affirmative force, *who knows whether ... not*, like the Latin *nescio an*, Est. 4, 14.

In Jon. 1, 7 and 8 the relative pronouns שֶׁ and שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר owing to the following לָמָּה have become also interrogative, *for whose cause?*

(d) וְ and הִנֵּה (comp. § 136. c) immediately after the interrogative serve to give vividness to the question; so also מֵעַתָּה (for which עַתָּה five times in Job) *then, now*, Gen. 27, 33 $\text{הֲיִשָּׂא הָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת מִיְּדִי}$ *who then is he?* Jud. 9, 38. Is. 19, 12. Job 17, 15; $\text{מֵעַתָּה הֲיִשָּׂא הָאִשָּׁה הַזֹּאת מִיְּדִי}$ *where then is ...?* However, מֵעַתָּה may also be placed at the end of the entire question (Ex. 33, 16. Is. 22, 1; also Hos. 13, 10, since either הֲיִשָּׂא is a dialectical form of הִשָּׂא , or הִשָּׂא should be read instead of it) or at the beginning of the question proper, after a strongly emphasized word, as in Gen. 27, 37¹.

(e) Sometimes one interrogative governs two co-ordinate clauses, the first of which should rather be subordinated to the second, so that the interrogative word strictly speaking affects only the second; thus Is. 5, 4 after מָה בָּרַעְתָּ *wherefore looked I...and it brought forth*, equivalent to, *wherefore brought it forth*, while I looked, &c.; Is. 50, 2; after וְ Num. 32, 6. Jer. 8, 4, also Num. 16, 22 (read וְהִנֵּה); after וְהִנֵּה Jos. 22, 20; after לָמָּה Is. 58, 3. 2 Chron. 32, 4². But וְ Job 4, 2 and וְהִנֵּה 4, 21 are separated from the verb to which they belong by the insertion of a conditional clause.

3. The affirmative answer is generally expressed, as in Latin, by *n* repeating the emphatic word in the question (or with the second person changed to the first, Gen. 24, 58. 27, 24. 29, 5. Jud. 13, 11), Gen. 29, 6. 37, 32 sq. 1 Sam. 23, 11. 26, 17. 1 Ki. 21, 10. Jer. 37, 17. (On כֵּן *if it be so* in the corrected text of 2 Ki. 10, 15, see § 159 *dd*.) As a negative answer the simple אֵין is sometimes sufficient, as in Gen. 19, 2 and elsewhere; comp. § 152. c; and in Jud. 4, 20 the simple אֵין equivalent to *no* or *no one*.

§ 151. Desiderative Sentences.

A wish may be expressed not only by the simple imperfect (§ 107. n), *a* cohortative (§ 108, especially with אִם § 108. c), jussive (§ 109; with אִם § 109. b), imperative (§ 110. a), perfect consecutive (§ 112. aa) or by a simple noun-clause (§ 116. r, note, and § 141. g) but also in the following ways:—

¹ On the other hand, in Job 9, 24 and 24, 25 עַתָּה is not prefixed to the מִי , but appended to the conditional sentence.

² Comp. the analogous sentences after כֵּן *because*, Is. 65, 12. Jer. 35, 17; after causal כֵּן 1 Sam. 26, 23; after כֵּן Is. 12, 1; likewise after כֵּן § 153 at the end; after כֵּן Deut. 8, 12–14. 25, 3. Jos. 6, 18.

1. By exclamations in the form of *interrogative clauses*¹, e.g. 2 Sam. 15, 4 מִי־יַשְׁמֵנִי שֹׁפֵט *who maketh me judge?* i. e. *O that I were made judge!* 1 Sam. 20, 10. 2 Sam. 23, 15. Especially frequent is the use of מִי־יִתֵּן (prop. *who gives?*) to introduce all kinds of desiderative clauses (see letter *δ*).—In Mal. 1, 10 the desiderative clause proper is co-ordinated with an interrogative clause מִי נִמְצָאֶם וְיִסְגְּרוּ דְלָתַיִם *would that one were among you and would shut the doors*, i. e. *O that one would shut the doors!*
- b* Rem. Sometimes the original sense of מִי־יִתֵּן is still plainly discernible, e.g. Jud. 9, 29 מִי־יִתֵּן אֶת־הָעָם הַזֶּה בְּיָדִי *who gives this people into my hand?* equivalent to, *O that this people were given into my hand!* comp. Ps. 55, 7. In these examples, however, מִי־יִתֵּן is still equivalent to *O had I!* and in numerous other instances the idea of *giving* has entirely disappeared, מִי־יִתֵּן having become stereotyped as a mere desiderative particle (*utinam*). The construction is either—
- (a) With the *accusative* (in accordance with its original meaning) of a substantive, Deut. 28, 67 *would that it were even! . . . morning!* Jud. 9, 29. Ps. 14, 7 (53, 7). 55, 7; with an accusative and a following infinitive, Job 11, 5; with two accusatives, Num. 11, 29. Jer. 8, 23; with the accusative of an infinitive, Ex. 16, 3. 2 Sam. 19, 1 אֲנִי תוֹהֲלֶיךָ מִי־יִתֵּן כֹּחֲמִי *would that I had died for thee* (for אֲנִי cf. § 135. f); of a participle, Job 31, 35; of a personal pronoun (as a suffix), Job 29, 2 (with a following *בְּ*; but מִי־יִתֵּןנִי Is. 27, 4 and Jer. 9, 1 with a following accusative is not simply equivalent to לִי מִי־יִתֵּן, but is properly *who endows me with*, &c.; comp. § 117. ff).—With a still greater weakening of the original meaning מִי־יִתֵּן is used with an adjective in Job 14, 4 *could a clean thing but come out of an unclean!* i. e. *how can a clean thing come*, &c.; similarly in Job 31, 31 *who can find one that hath not been satisfied!*
- c* (*b*) With a following perfect, Job 23, 3 (comp. § 120. e); with a perfect consecutive, Deut. 5, 26 *O that they had such an heart!*
- d* (*c*) With a following imperfect, Job 6, 8. 13, 5. 14, 13; in Job 19, 23 the imperfect is twice added with *Wāw* (comp. letter *a* above, on Mal. 1, 10).
- On the cohortative in the apodosis to such desiderative clauses, comp. § 108. f.
- e* 2. The wish may also be expressed by the particles אִם (Ps. 81, 9. 95, 7. 139, 19. Prov. 24, 11. 1 Chron. 4, 10; always with a following imperfect) and לֵי (for which in Ps. 119, 5 we have אֲחִלֵּי, 2 Ki. 5, 3 אֲחִלֵּי, from אָח *ah!* and לֵי = לִי; both with a following imperfect) *si, o si! utinam*². לֵי is followed by the imperfect, Gen. 17, 18.

¹ The transition from a question to a wish may be seen, e.g. in Num. 11, 4 *who shall give us flesh to eat?* i. e. *O that we had flesh to eat!*

² Comp. a similar transition from a conditional to a desiderative particle, in consequence of the suppression of the apodosis, in the English, *O if I had!* and the like; e.g. Num. 22, 29 *if there were* (לֵי יִשְׁ) *a sword in my hand now had I surely killed thee!*

Job 6, 2; by the jussive, Gen. 30, 34 (rather concessive, equivalent to *let it be so*); by the perfect, as the expression of a wish that something might have happened in past time (comp. § 106. *p*), Num. 14, 2 *לֹא מָוֹתָנוּ* *would that we had died*; 20, 3 and Jos. 7, 7 (both times *לֹא*); on the other hand, Is. 48, 18 and 63, 19 (both times *לֹא*) to express a wish that something expected in the future may already have happened.—On *לֹא* with the imperative (by an anacoluthon) Gen. 23, 13 comp. § 110. *e*. On the perfect after *אִם* *יִי* Gen. 40, 14. 2 Ki. 5, 20, comp. § 106. *n*, note 2.

§ 152. Negative Sentences.

1. Independent sentences are made negative by the adverbs *לֹא* *a* (Job 6, 21 *K'lh*. perhaps preserved as a substantive)=the Greek *οὐ*, *not*, *לֹא*=the Greek *μή* (Job 24, 25 as a substantive), *אִין* (*it is*) *not*; *טָרַם* *not yet*, *אָפֵס* *not*, *אָפֵסִי* (comp. § 90. *m*) *not*. The forms *בֹּל*, *בָּלִי*, *בָּלִי* *not* belong almost entirely to poetry.—With regard to *לֹא* and *אִין* the main distinction is that verbal-clauses (rarely noun-clauses, see letter *e*) are regularly negated by *לֹא* (besides its use as negating single words¹), while *אִין* is used exclusively with noun-clauses (see the examples below).

¹ Especially in compounds, e.g. *לֹא אֱלֹהִים* lit. *a not-God* (Germ. *Ungott*) who is indeed called a god, but is anything but really a god, Deut. 32, 21; *לֹא אָמְלָה* verse 17, comp. Jer. 5, 7. 2 Chron. 13, 9; *לֹא אָדָם* lit. *a not-people* (Germ. *Unvolk*), Deut. 32, 21; *לֹא דָבָר* *a nothing*, Amos 6, 13; *לֹא עֵץ* lit. *not-wood*, Is. 10, 15; *לֹא אִישׁ* *not-man*, *לֹא אָדָם* lit. *not-man*, *superhuman* (of God), Is. 31, 8; *לֹא צֶדֶק* *un-righteousness*, Jer. 22, 13, comp. Ezek. 22, 29; *לֹא סִדְרִים* *disorder*, Job 10, 22; *לֹא חָקָם* *not-violence*, 16, 17; after *לֵךְ* Job 26, 2 sq. (*לֹא חֵן*) *helplessness*, *לֹא חֵן* *insipientia*; comp. also Is. 55, 2 *לֹא שָׂבָה* *for what is unsatisfying*; Ps. 44, 13. Job 8, 11. 15, 32. 1 Chron. 12, 33.—In Num. 20, 5 a construct state with several genitives is negated by *לֹא*.—*לֹא* is also used with an infinitive, Num. 35, 23; with an adjective, *לֹא חָכָם* *unwise*, Deut. 32, 6. Hos. 13, 13; *לֹא צַדִּיק* *impious*, Ps. 43, 1; *לֹא עָזָה* and *לֹא עָצָה* *not strong*, Prov. 30, 25 sq.; *לֹא צַדִּיק* *unsuitably*, 2 Ki. 7, 9; *לֹא טוֹב* *not-good*, Is. 65, 2. Ezek. 20, 25, &c.; *לֹא טוֹר* *not-clean*, 2 Chron. 30, 17; with a participle, e.g. Jer. 2, 2 (*unseen*); 6, 8. Ezek. 4, 14. 22, 24. Zeph. 2, 1. 3, 5; the Masora, however, requires *נִחָמָה* in Is. 54, 11, *נִחָמָה* in 62, 12, *נִחָמָה* in Jer. 6, 8, *נִחָמָה* in Hos. 1, 6, i.e. always 3rd sing. fem. perf. in pause = *she was not comforted*, &c., and consequently not compounds, but either relative clauses or (Is. 54, 11. Hos. 1, 6, and especially 2, 25) main clauses instead of proper names.—On the above compounds generally, cf. the dissertation mentioned in § 81. *d*, note 2; on their use in sentences expressing a state, to convey attributive ideas, see letter *w* below.

- b The conjunctions **וְלֹא** and **לֹא** *that not*, serve to negative dependent clauses. The particular uses of these particles are as follows:—

(a) **לֹא** (less frequently **לֹאִי**), like *ob, oñ*, is used regularly for the *objective, unconditional* negation, and hence is usually connected with the perfect or imperfect (as indicative); on **לֹא** with the imperfect to express an unconditional prohibition, see § 107. o; on its use with the jussive, see § 109. d.—On **לֹא** for **לֹאִי** *nonne*, in interrogative sentences, comp. § 150. a. In connexion with **כֹּל** *כל* (= any), **לֹא** is used to express an *absolute* negation, *nullus, none whatever* (comp. the French *ne . . . personne, ne . . . rien*), usually in the order **כֹּל** . . . **לֹא**, e.g. Gen. 3, 1 **לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִכָּל עֵץ הַגָּן** *ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden*; 9, 11. Ex. 10, 15. 20, 10. Lev. 7, 23. Deut. 8, 9. Jer. 13, 7. 32, 17 **לֹא בְּלִי-דָבָר** *nothing at all*; comp. the same statement in a rhetorical question, Jer. 32, 27; Prov. 12, 21. 30, 30 **לֹא יִפְּנֶי-בֶלֶל** *and turneth not away for any*; 2 Chron. 32, 15; but comp. also the inverted order, Ex. 12, 16 **לֹא יִעָשֶׂה** *no manner of work shall be done*; 12, 43. 15, 26. 22, 21. Lev. 16, 17. Job 33, 13. Dan. 11, 37. The meaning is different when **כֹּל** by being determinate is used in the sense of *whole*, e.g. Num. 23, 13 **לֹא תִרְאֶה** *thou shalt not see them all*, but only a part.

Analogous to **כֹּל** . . . **לֹא** is the use of **אִישׁ** . . . **לֹא** Gen. 23, 6 and elsewhere, in verbal-clauses in the sense of *no one at all, not a single one*.

- c Rem. 1. The examples in which **לֹא** is used absolutely as a negative answer, equivalent to *certainly not! no!* must be regarded as extremely short verbal-clauses, e.g. Gen. 19, 2 (**לֹא** according to the context for **לֹאִי** &c.); 23, 11. 42, 10. Hag. 2, 12. Job 23, 6, sometimes with a following **כִּי** *but*, Gen. 19, 2 (see above); Jos. 5, 14. 1 Ki. 3, 22.

- d 2. The negation of *noun-clauses* by **לֹא** (as opposed to the regular negation by **אֵין**) always includes a certain emphasis, since the force of the negation falls rather upon a particular word (comp. e.g. Ezek. 36, 32), than upon the whole clause. In 2 Sam. 3, 34 **לֹא־אִסְרוּת יָדֶיךָ** *thy hands were not bound*, a participle is thus specially negated by **לֹא**; cf. Ps. 74, 9, where, however, **לֹא** is separated from the participle by **אִתְּךָ**, and Job 12, 3. As a rule, *noun-clauses* with a pronominal subject are thus negated by **לֹא**, Gen. 20, 12. Num. 35, 23 (Deut. 4, 42. 19, 4); 1 Sam. 15, 29. 2 Sam. 21, 2. Jer. 4, 22. Ps. 22, 7. Job 28, 14, parallel with **אֵין**; generally with **לֹא** before a substantival predicate, e.g. Ex. 4, 10 **לֹא אִישׁ דְּבָרִים** *I am not a man of words*; Amos 5, 18.—*Noun-clauses* with a substantival subject, Gen. 29, 7. Num. 23, 19. Is. 22, 2. 44, 19. Hag. 1, 2. Ps. 22, 3. Job 9, 32. 18, 17. 21, 9. 22, 16. 36, 26 (with **וְ** of the apodosis); 41, 2; in Job 9, 33 even **לֹא־יֵשׁ** *non est* is used instead of **אֵין**.—In Prov. 18, 5 **לֹא** is used before an adjectival predicate; in 1 Sam. 20, 26 (where a preceding *noun-clause* is negated by **בְּלִי**) read **לֹא כֹהֵר** with the LXX, for **לֹא כֹהֹר**. On **לֹא** for **אֵין** in circumstantial clauses to express attributive ideas, see letter *u* below.

- e 3. As a rule **לֹא** stands immediately before the verb, but sometimes is separated from it (frequently to bring into special prominence another word which follows it); thus Job 22, 7. Eccles. 10, 10 before the object and verb; Num. 16, 29 before the subject and verb; Deut. 8, 9. 2 Sam. 3, 34. Ps. 49, 18. 103, 10. Job 13, 16.

34, 23, before a complementary adjunct. In Deut. 32, 5 לֹא according to the accentuation even stands at the end of the clause (*they offend him not*); but undoubtedly לֹא בָנִים are to be taken together.—On the position of לֹא with the infinitive absolute, see § 113. v.

(b) לֹא־ is used like *μή* and *ne* to express a *subjective* and *conditional* negation, *f* and hence especially in connexion with the jussive (§ 109. c and e) to introduce prohibitions, warnings, negative desires, and requests. On לֹא־ with the imperfect, see § 107. p; on 2 Ki. 6, 27, see § 109. h.

Rem. 1. לֹא־ (like לֹא, see letter a, note, above) may be used to form a compound word, as in Prov. 12, 28 מוֹת־לֹא *not-death* (immortality); though all the early versions read מוֹת־לֹא. The instances in which לֹא appears to stand absolutely, equivalent to *no*, *certainly not* (like *μή* for *μή γένῃται*), e.g. Ruth 1, 13 אֵל בְּנֹתַי *nay, my daughters*, and Gen. 19, 18. 33, 10 (אֵל־לֹא), are also due (see letter c) to extreme shortening of a full clause (in 2 Sam. 13, 25 such a clause is repeated immediately afterwards); thus in 2 Sam. 1, 21. Is. 62, 2. Ps. 83, 2 יְהוָה is evidently to be supplied, and in Joel 2, 13. Amos 5, 14. Prov. 8, 10 the corresponding jussive from the preceding imperatives (in Prov. 17, 12 from the preceding infinitive absolute).

2. לֹא־, like לֹא, regularly stands immediately before the verb, but in Is. 64, 8. *h* Jer. 10, 24. 15, 15. Ps. 6, 2. 38, 2 before another strongly emphasized member of the sentence¹.

(c) לֹא construct state (unless it be sometimes merely a contracted form, cf. *i* שֵׁנִים for שְׁנַיִם) of לֹא־ *not-being* (as also the absolute state, see below) is the negative of הוּא *being*; comp., for example, Gen. 31, 29 with Neh. 5, 5. As הוּא (*he, she, it is, was, &c.*) includes the idea of *being* in all tenses, so לֹא־, לֹא includes the idea of *not being* in all tenses. Hence—

(1) The absolute state לֹא, with an evident transition to the meaning of a *k* verbal predicate, *there does not exist*, always follows the word negated, e.g. Is. 37, 3 (2 Ki. 19, 3) וְכַח אֵין לָלֶכֶת *and strength does not exist to bring forth*; Gen. 2, 5 אֵין *was not present*; Ex. 17, 7 אֵין־הוּא *or is he not?* after הוּא *is he . . . ?* (cf. Num. 13, 20); Lev. 26, 37. Num. 20, 5. Jud. 4, 20 (אֵין *no*). In 1 Sam. 9, 4 and 10, 14 אֵין is used in reference to a plural; 1 Ki. 18, 10. Is. 41, 17. 45, 21. 59, 11. Mic. 7, 2. Prov. 13, 4. 25, 14. Job 3, 9 אֵין *and let there be none, let none come!* (comp. Prov. 5, 17); Eccles. 3, 19.—Also comp. finally אֵין־הוּא *if it be not so*, Gen. 30, 1. Ex. 32, 32. Jud. 9, 15. 2 Ki. 2, 10.—Quite anomalous is אֵין Job 35, 15 before a perfect as an emphatic negation; the text, however, can hardly be correct.

(2) The construct state אֵין stands in its natural position immediately before *l* the substantive whose non-existence it predicates, or before the subject of the sentence which is to be negated. To the former class belong also the very numerous instances in which אֵין is joined to a participle, e.g. 1 Sam. 26, 12 וְאֵין רֹאֶה וְאֵין יוֹדֵעַ *and there was not one seeing, &c., i. e. and no man*

¹ In Jer. 51, 3 the pointing לֹא־ occurs twice instead of לֹא, and is thus, in the opinion of the Masoretes, equivalent to *against him that bendeth*; but undoubtedly we should read לֹא־.

saw it, nor knew it, neither did any awake; so especially *וְאֵין* with a participle in subordinate *circumstantial* or *descriptive clauses*, such as Is. 5, 29 *וְאֵין מְצִיל מִיָּדוֹ* and he shall carry it away, while there is none delivering, i. e. *without any one's delivering it*; Ps. 7, 3, &c.; Lev. 26, 6 and elsewhere, *וְאֵין מְחַדֵּד* without any one's making you afraid; comp. § 141. *וְאֵין* is used as the negation of an entire noun-clause, e. g. Gen. 39, 23. Num. 14, 42 *וְאֵין יְהוָה בְּקִרְבָּכֶם* the Lord is not among you; Gen. 37, 29 *וְאֵין יוֹסֵף בְּבֹרֶךְ* Joseph was not in the pit.

- m (3) When the subject which is to be negated is a personal pronoun, it is joined as a suffix to *וְאֵין*, according to § 100. *וְאֵין אֲנִי* I am not, was not, shall not be; *וְאֵין אַתָּה*, fem. *וְאֵין אַתְּ*, thou art not, &c.; *וְאֵין הוּא*, fem. *וְאֵין הִיא* he, she is not, &c.; also absolutely, Gen. 42, 13 *וְאֵין הוּא* (5, 24 *וְאֵין הוּא*) no longer alive; *וְאֵין הֵם* they are not, &c. When the accompanying predicate is a verb, it follows again (see letter l) in the form of a participle, since *וְאֵין* always introduces a noun-clause, e. g. Ex. 5, 10 *וְאֵין אֲנִי נֹתֵן* I will not give; 8, 17. Deut. 1, 32.

- n Rem. In Neh. 4, 17 *וְאֵין אֲנִי* for *וְאֵין אֲנִי* is due to its being co-ordinate with three other (substantial) subjects; these are again expressly summed up in *וְאֵין אֲנִי*.—In Hag. 2, 17 *וְאֵין אַתְּכֶם* the pronominal complement of *וְאֵין* appears to follow with the sign of the accusative¹; but most probably we should read with the LXX *וְאֵין אַתְּכֶם* for *וְאֵין אַתְּכֶם*.

- o (4) The fact that *וְאֵין* (like *וְאֵין*) always includes the idea of a verb (*is not, was not, &c.*) led finally to such a predominance of the verbal element, that the original character of *וְאֵין* as a construct state (but cf. letter i above) was forgotten, and accordingly it is very frequently separated from its noun (substantive or participle); especially so by the insertion of shorter words (of the nature of enclitics), e. g. Is. 1, 6, *וְאֵין לִי* Lev. 11, 10, 12, *וְאֵין לִי* Gen. 11, 30, *וְאֵין לִי* Ps. 14, 3, *וְאֵין לִי* Jud. 18, 10. Ex. 12, 30; but comp. also Ps. 5, 10, 6, 6, 32, 2, and *וְאֵין* used absolutely in Ex. 22, 2. 1 Ki. 8, 9. Ruth 4, 4.—Hence, finally, the transposition of *וְאֵין* and its noun was even possible, e. g. Gen. 40, 8 and 41, 15 *וְאֵין אֹתוֹ* and there is none that can interpret it; Gen. 47, 13. Jud. 14, 6. 1 Sam. 21, 2. Is. 1, 30. Jer. 30, 13. Hab. 2, 19. Prov. 5, 17 (*וְאֵין* = *neve sint*; comp. letter k above, on Job 3, 9); 30, 27. In Gen. 19, 31. Ex. 5, 16 *וְאֵין* is placed between the subject and predicate.

- p Rem. 1. Like *וְאֵין* ... *לֹא* or *לֹא* ... *וְאֵין* (see letter b above) so also *וְאֵין* expresses an absolute negation, e. g. Eccles. 1, 9 *וְאֵין כֵּל-חַדָּשׁ* there is no new thing, &c.; Dan. 1, 4 (comp. also *וְאֵין מְחַדֵּד* there is nothing, 1 Ki. 18, 43. Eccles. 5, 13); as also *וְאֵין* ... *לֹא* Hab. 2, 19; comp. *וְאֵין מְחַדֵּד* Jud. 14, 6.

- q 2. Undoubtedly akin to *וְאֵין* in origin is the negative syllable *אֵ* occurring in the two compounds *אֵי בְּבוֹד* (as a proper name, 1 Sam. 4, 21; Baer *בְּבוֹד אֵי*) and *אֵי אִינִי* not innocent, Job 22, 30; but the proper name *אֵי אִינִי* is doubtful, and the fem. *אֵי אִינִי* very doubtful. In Ethiopic this *אֵ* is the most common form of negation, prefixed even to verbs.

¹ According to De Lagarde, *Novae psalterii graeci editionis specimen*, p. 26, *וְאֵין אַתְּכֶם* Ps. 3, 3 is also an accusative after *וְאֵין*.

(d) **עוֹד** *not yet*, when referring to past time is used, as a rule (§ 107. c), with the imperfect, Gen. 2, 5 **עוֹד** . . . **עַל** *none . . . yet*; see letters *b* and *p* above; Gen. 19, 4. 24, 45. Jos. 2, 8. 1 Sam. 3, 3; with the imperfect in the sense of a present, Ex. 10, 7 **הֲיָדָעְתָּ עוֹד** *knowest thou not yet?* Ex. 9, 30.

(e) **אֵין** (prop. a substantive, *cessation*) *no longer*, including the verbal idea *s* of *existing*, comp. Dent. 32, 36. Is. 45, 6. 14. 46, 9; used absolutely, Amos 6, 10; used interrogatively **אֵין עוֹד** *is there none left?* &c., 2 Sam. 9, 3; frequently also in the sense of *non nisi*; with '— paragogic (§ 90. m) **אֵין** Is. 47, 8. 10. Zeph. 2, 15 **אֲנִי וְאֵין** *I am, and there is none else*.

(f) **לֹא**¹, in poetic and prophetic style, and with a certain emphasis, = **אֵין**, is used with the imperfect, e. g. Is. 26, 14. 33, 20. 23 (immediately afterwards with a perfect); Hos. 7, 2. Ps. 49, 13. Prov. 10, 30 (but Is. 14, 21 before the jussive, equivalent to **אֵין**); before an adjective, Prov. 24, 23.

(g) **בְּלִי** with a perfect, Gen. 31, 20. Is. 14, 6; with an imperfect, Job 41, 18; to negative a participle, Hos. 7, 8. Ps. 19, 4; to negative an adjective, 2 Sam. 1, 21.

(h) **בְּלִי** to negative an adjective, 1 Sam. 20, 26; on **בְּלִי** Ezek. 13, 3, see letter *x*; on **לֹא** as the regular negative with the infinitive construct, see § 114. *s*; on **בְּלִי** as a conjunction, see letter *x* below.

On **אֵין** as a negative particle in oaths (*verily not*), see § 149. *c* above.

Rem. on **לֹא**, **אֵין**, **בְּלִי**. To the category of negative sentences belongs also the expression of negative attributes by means of **לֹא**, **בְּלִי** *not* (both so used almost exclusively in poetic language) or **אֵין** with a following substantive, mostly in the simplest form of circumstantial clause, e. g. 2 Sam. 23, 4 **בֹּקֶר לֹא עָבֹד** *a morning when there are not clouds*, i. e. *a cloudless morning*; comp. Job 12, 24. 26, 2 b. 38, 26 **לֹא אִישׁ** *where no man is*, i. e. *uninhabited*; 1 Chron. 2, 30. 32 **לֹא בָנִים** *childless*; so also **בְּלִי** e. g. Job 24, 10 and **אֵין** e. g. Ps. 88, 5 *I am as a man* **אֵין עֲזָרָה** *there is not help*, i. e. *like a helpless man*; Is. 47, 1. Hos. 7, 11; **אֵין מִסְפָּר** *countless*, Cant. 6, 8, &c., but usually (Ps. 104, 25, &c.) like a proper circumstantial clause (comp. § 141. e) connected by *Wāw*, **וְאֵין מִסְפָּר** (comp. § 155. e), e. g. Job 30, 13 **לֹא עוֹד לָמוֹ** *they for whom there is no helper*, i. e. *the helpless* (but probably **עוֹד** is only an intrusion from 29, 12, and we should read **עֲזָרָה** *without any one's restraining them*; in 29, 12 translate *the fatherless and him that had none to help him*; in Ps. 72, 12 **וְאֵין עֲזָרָה** is used in the same sense); Hab. 1, 14; with **אֵין** Is. 45, 9 *thy work* is that of a man *who hath no hands*; Zech. 9, 11 *out of the waterless pit*².

How far such compounds finally came to be regarded by the language simply as negative adjectives, may be seen partly from the fact that they (as also relative clauses analogous to the above) are frequently co-ordinated with real adjectives, Joel 1, 6. Ps. 72, 12. Job 29, 12; comp. also Is. 59, 10, where **בְּאֵין עֲזָרָה** is

¹ Evidently from **בָּלָה** *to waste away*, from which stem also **בָּלָה** (whence **בְּלִי** § 90. m), originally substantives, are formed.

² In Prov. 9, 13 (perhaps also 14, 7; but see Delitzsch on the passage) a verbal-clause is used co-ordinately in this way as a periphrasis for an adjective.

parallel with **בְּעִוְרִים**; partly from their being introduced by the sign of the dative **לְ**, e. g. Is. 40, 29 (= and to the powerless); Job 26, 2 a. 3. Neh. 8, 10.

- w (z) **לֵּשֶׁת** *lest, that not*, at the beginning of a clause expressing a fear or precaution, hence especially after such ideas as *fearing*, Gen. 32, 12 and elsewhere (comp. *δειδω μή, vereror ne*), *taking heed*, frequently after **הִשָּׁמֵר**, **הִשְׁמַרְתָּ** Gen. 24, 6. 31, 24 and elsewhere, *taking care*, 2 Ki. 10, 23, &c. Not infrequently the idea on which **לֵּשֶׁת** depends, is only virtually contained in the main clause, e. g. Gen. 19, 19 *I cannot escape to the mountain* (because I am afraid), **לֵּשֶׁת** *lest some evil overtake me*; Gen. 26, 9. 38, 11; also in Gen. 44, 34 from the rhetorical question *how shall I . . . ?* we must understand *I cannot*, governing **לֵּשֶׁת**. This is especially the case after an appeal to do or not to do an action by which something may be prevented (in which case **לֵּשֶׁת** is simply equivalent to the final *ne*); comp. e. g. Gen. 11, 4. 19, 15. Num. 20, 18 (where **לֵּשֶׁת** *lest* is separated from the verb by a strongly emphasized substantive); Jud. 15, 12 after *swear unto me*; Prov. 24, 18.—In Gen. 3, 22 and now, *lest he put forth his hand*, &c., **לֵּשֶׁת** is to be regarded as virtually dependent on a cohortative, which immediately afterwards (verse 23) is changed into an historic tense; cf. also Gen. 26, 7. 31, 31. 42, 4. Ex. 13, 17. 1 Sam. 13, 19. 27, 11. Ps. 38, 17, in every case after **כִּי אֶמְדָּתִי**, **כִּי אֶמְדָּתִי**, &c. = *I thought*, &c., *I must beware lest*, &c.

Rem. According to § 107. g, **לֵּשֶׁת** is naturally followed by the imperfect (or jussive); for the exceptions, 2 Sam. 20, 6. 2 Ki. 2, 16, see § 107. g, note 3; comp., moreover, 2 Ki. 10, 23 **לֵּשֶׁת** *look lest there be here*, &c.

- x (h) **לֵּשֶׁת** *that . . . not*, with the imperfect, Ex. 20, 20. 2 Sam. 14, 14 (in Jer. 23, 14 read the infinitive **לֵּשֶׁת** for **לֵּשֶׁת**, in 27, 8 **לֵּשֶׁת** for **לֵּשֶׁת**). In Ezek. 13, 3 **לֵּשֶׁת** is a relative clause governed by **לְ** = *according to things which they have not seen*.
- y 2. Two negatives in the same sentence do not neutralize each other (as in *nonnulli, non nemo*), but make the negation the more emphatic (like *οὐκ οὐδεὶς, οὐκ οὐδαμῶς, nulli—non, nemo non*); e. g. 1 Ki. 10, 21 **לֵּשֶׁת** . . . **לֵּשֶׁת** *silver was accounted as nothing at all* (in 2 Chron. 9, 20 without **לֵּשֶׁת**); Zeph. 2, 2 (if the text is correct) **לֵּשֶׁת** *before there shall (not) come*. This especially applies to the compounds formed by the union of **לֵּשֶׁת** or **לֵּשֶׁת** with **לֵּשֶׁת** *without* (§ 119. y), e. g. Is. 5, 9 (6, 11) **לֵּשֶׁת** (for which in Jer. 2, 15 **לֵּשֶׁת**, prop. *without no inhabitant*, i. e. *so that no inhabitant is left there*). On the other hand, in Is. 50, 2 **לֵּשֶׁת** the **לֵּשֶׁת** is causative, *because there is no water*; as also in Ex. 14, 11 **לֵּשֶׁת** *is it because there were no . . . ?* 2 Ki. 1, 3. 6. 16. In Eccles. 3, 11 **לֵּשֶׁת** *except that (yet so that man cannot, &c.)*.
- z 3. The negative sometimes extends its influence from the first to a second negative sentence parallel with it (which may or may not

have *Wāw*); e.g. 1 Sam. 2, 3 *talk not so much arrogancy; let (not) boasting come out of your mouth*; Ex. 28, 43. Lev. 19, 12. 22, 9. 15 sq. Num. 16, 14. 23, 19. Deut. 7, 25. Is. 23, 4. 28, 27. 38, 18. 47, 14. Ezek. 16, 47. Ps. 9, 19. 13, 5. 35, 19. 38, 2. 44, 19. 75, 6. Job 28, 17 (so לָמָּה לָמָּה *why . . . not?* in Job 3, 11 also affects the parallel clause).

§ 153. Restrictive and Intensive Clauses.

The particles וְ, אֲנִי, only, serve to introduce restrictive clauses, and כִּי, אֲנִי, also, besides, even, intensive clauses. It is to be observed, that the force of these particles does not necessarily affect the word which immediately follows (as is the case with וְ Gen. 7, 23. 34, 15; אֲנִי Gen. 6, 5. Amos 3, 2; even וְ אֲנִי הִנֵּה *hath he indeed only?* Num. 12, 2; כִּי Gen. 27, 34. Job 7, 11; אֲנִי Deut. 15, 17), but very frequently extends to the whole of the following sentence. Thus with וְ, e.g. Num. 14, 9. 1 Ki. 17, 13. Prov. 17, 11. Job 13, 15. 14, 22. 16, 7. 23, 6; אֲנִי Gen. 20, 11. 24, 8. Ps. 32, 6. Prov. 13, 10; כִּי Gen. 27, 33. 32, 21 (אֲנִי כִּי); 1 Sam. 22, 7. 28, 20. Zech. 9, 11. Prov. 17, 26. 20, 11; אֲנִי Job 14, 3. 15, 4.—In Mal. 1, 10 and Job 2, 10 כִּי is placed before two co-ordinate sentences, although, strictly speaking, it applies only to the second. Comp. the analogous examples in § 150. m.

§ 154. Sentences connected by *Wāw*.

*Wāw copulativum*¹ (וְ) serves to connect together two or more *a* sentences, or single words (on its various vocalization, cf. § 104. d-g).

¹ For further particulars of the use of *wāw copulativum*, see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, i. 393 sqq. On its use in the co-ordination of similar tenses and moods (e.g. five imperfects consecutive in Gen. 25, 34, five perfects with וְ) as well as of dissimilar tenses and moods, the remarks made in the treatment of the tenses will suffice. With regard to the interconnexion of single *nouns* by וְ (which strictly speaking is always really a contraction of so many clauses into a single sentence) the following observations may be made:—

(a) Contrary to English usage, which in lengthy enumerations uses the *and* to connect only the last member of the series, in Hebrew *polysyndeton* is customary, as in Gen. 12, 16 *wāw copulativum* six times, 24, 35 seven times, 15, 19 sqq. nine times. and in Jos. 7, 24 ten times. Sometimes, however, only the last two words are joined (so in a series of three members, Gen. 5, 32. 10, 1. 11, 26. 13, 2. 14, 1. 30, 39, &c.; the last three out of a series of four, Jer. 2, 26); less frequently only the first two, Ps. 45, 9; cf. § 132. d. The formula וְשֶׁנֶּחֱמָה וְשֶׁנֶּחֱמָה *yesterday (and) the day before yesterday*, Ex. 5, 8 and elsewhere, is always without the copula.

Its use, however, is by no means restricted merely to joining together sentences which are actually co-ordinate. Frequently the language employs merely the simple connexion by *Wāw*, even to introduce an antithesis (Gen. 17, 21. 19, 19. Lev. 2, 12. Job 6, 25, and very frequently in circumstantial noun-clauses), or when one of the two clauses is not co-ordinated, but subordinated to the other. On the use of *ʔ* to introduce circumstantial clauses, cf. especially § 141. *c* and § 142. *d*; introducing causal clauses, § 158. *a*; comparative clauses, § 161. *a*; final clauses, § 165. *a*; consecutive clauses, § 166. *a*. On *wāw apodosis*, comp. § 143. *d*, and the sections there cited; on the use of *Wāw* in numerical sayings, comp. § 134. *s*.

On the other hand, the *constructio asyndetos* in a series of verbs is used as a rhetorical expedient to produce a hurried and so an impassioned description; e.g. Jud. 5, 27 *at her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay*; Ex. 15, 9. 1 Sam. 15, 6. Jer. 4, 7. Amos 5, 21. Ps. 14, 1. Job 20, 19. 28, 4. 29, 8. Cant. 2, 11. 5, 6.

(*b*) Frequently *wāw copulativum* is also *explanatory* (like *isque, et—quidem*, and the German *und swar*, English *to wit*), and is then called *wāw explicativum*, e.g. Gen. 4, 4 *and (i.e. namely) of the fat thereof*; Ex. 24, 12. 25, 12 (*to wit two*); 27, 14. 28, 23. 1 Sam. 17, 34 *and that too with the bear*; 2 Sam. 13, 20. Ia. 57, 11. Jer. 17, 10. Amos 3, 11. 4, 10. Zech. 9, 9. Prov. 3, 12. Neh. 8, 13. 2 Chron. 23, 10 (but in 1 Sam. 28, 3 the *ʔ* before *וַיִּפֹּל* is to be omitted with the LXX); cf. also such combinations as *וְעַד—וְעַתָּה* from . . . and even to . . ., Gen. 13, 3. 14, 23. 19, 4. 11, &c.—In 1 Sam. 6, 11 (see Driver on the passage), 2 Sam. 1, 23, &c., *ʔ* is equivalent to *yea, and*; in Ia. 32, 7 *even*; 1 Ki. 1, 21. Job 6, 14 *else—* is used to express emphasis (= *and especially*), e.g. in Gen. 3, 16 *וְהָיָה*; Ia. 2, 1. Ps. 18, 1, perhaps also in Job 10, 17 *yea, a whole host*; 2 Chron. 16, 14.—An undoubted example of what is called *wāw concomitantes* occurs in Job 41, 12 *a seething pot [וְהָיָה] with burning rushes*; cf. Ex. 10, 10 (*with your little ones*), 12, 8. Lev. 1, 12. Ia. 42, 5. In Arabic this *wāw concom.* is followed by the accusative. *ʔ—ʔ* is used in the sense of *both—and* in Ps. 76, 7. Dan. 1, 3. 8, 13. On *ʔ—ʔ* as meaning *sive—sive*, comp. § 162. *b*.

(*c*) See the Lexicon on adverbs used in a copulative sense, such as *וְגַם* also, moreover, summing up a number, e.g. *וְגַם—וְגַם* both together, Gen. 27, 45. Prov. 17, 15; *וְכָל* all together; as an intensive *and*, e.g. Gen. 30, 8. 37, 7. 1 Sam. 30, 8; comp. also such examples as 1 Sam. 24, 12 *see, yea see!* *וְגַם—וְגַם* or *וְגַם—וְגַם* Gen. 24, 44 = *both—and*; *וְגַם* occurs three times in Gen. 24, 25 and 32, 20; also *וְגַם*, which is generally still more intensive, in the sense of *also, in addition to this, even*, and belongs rather to poetry, and to the later language; frequently also equivalent to a mere *and*, but sometimes adversative *but now*, Ps. 44, 10 and elsewhere; and *וְגַם—וְגַם* (also three times repeated), equivalent to *both—and*; comp. *וְגַם וְגַם* and even, Lev. 26, 44; *וְגַם—וְגַם* prop. *add to this also that*, equivalent to *not to mention*, according to the context either *quanto magis* or *quanto minus*.

Rem. Sometimes *wāw* copulativum joins a sentence apparently to what immediately precedes, but in reality to a sentence which is suppressed and which must, therefore, be supplied from the context. So especially *ו* with imperatives to express inferences, e.g. 1 Ki. 2, 22 *אֲשֶׁר* *ask now rather*; Ezek. 18, 32 *for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth . . .*, *וְהִשִּׁיב* *wherefore turn yourselves*. Also at the beginning of a speech in loose connexion with an act or speech of another person, e.g. Ex. 2, 20. 2 Sam. 18, 11. 24, 3. 2 Ki. 4, 14. 41. 7, 13. 2 Chron. 25, 9; comp. also Jos. 7, 7 (*וְהָיָה*). Ps. 2, 10. 4, 4. Is. 8, 7. Sometimes the suppression of the protasis is due to passionate excitement or haste, which does not allow itself time as it were for the full expression of the thought; this is especially illustrated by Num. 12, 14. 20, 3 (*וְהָיָה*). 1 Sam. 10, 12. 15, 14. 22, 14. 28, 16. 2 Sam. 18, 12. 24, 3. 1 Ki. 2, 22 (*וְהָיָה*). 2 Ki. 1, 10. 7, 19 (comp. verse 2); Is. 3, 14. Zech. 2, 10. Ps. 2, 6 (at the same time a circumstantial clause *whereas I = and yet I have*, &c.); comp. also a new clause beginning with the formula of wishing *וְיָשָׁם* Num. 11, 29. Jud. 9, 29; on the disconnected use of *וְהָיָה* and *וְיָשָׁם* cf. § 159. *dd*.

§ 155. Relative Clauses.

See V. Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, Leipzig, 1894 (cf. the heading of § 138 above).

1. By § 138. *a, e*, relative clauses are divided into two classes: those *a* which are used for the nearer definition of a noun (substantive or pronoun), and those which are not dependent on a noun. The former may be called *incomplete*, the latter *complete* relative clauses.

Complete relative clauses, as a rule (see the exceptions under *b* letter *n*), are introduced by the originally demonstrative pronoun *זֶה*; see further in § 138. *e*. Similarly, incomplete relative clauses may also be introduced by *זֶה*, or by some other demonstrative pronoun; see further in § 138. *a* and *g-k*. Very frequently, however, especially in poetic style, the attributive relation is expressed by simple co-ordination¹.

The governing substantive or pronoun is frequently (in certain *c* cases *always*) resumed by a pronominal suffix or an adverb. The resumption may, however, be omitted, just as in relative clauses introduced by *זֶה*, &c.; see § 138. *f*.

In Arabic a distinction is made between relative clauses used for the nearer *d* definition of a *determinate* substantive (*sila*), and those which are attached to an

¹ The old view that all these cases arise from the omission of *זֶה* is unsatisfactory. These co-ordinated attributive clauses are rather a mere subdivision of the various kinds of circumstantial clauses (see § 156) which may be attached to a *nomen regens*. Cf. in English *this is the letter (which) he wrote to me*.

indeterminate substantive (*sifa*). The former must be introduced by the demonstrative pronoun *alladî*, the latter are always simply co-ordinated. The same distinction was no doubt originally observed in Hebrew, since simply co-ordinated relative clauses are most commonly found after indeterminate substantives (see the examples below), and in cases like Deut. 28, 49 *וְאֶתְּ לֹא תֵּשָׁע לְשׁוֹנוֹ* *a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand*; cf. Is. 66, 13, and especially 1 Sam. 3, 11), the addition of *אֵלֶּךָ* is explained from the special stress laid on the indeterminate substantive¹, *a nation of such a kind, thou understandest not their tongue*. On the other hand, in poetic style at least, *אֵלֶּךָ* is somewhat frequently omitted even after a determinate noun, but only rarely in prose (except by the Chronicler; cf. 1 Chron. 12, 23. 29, 1. 2 Chron. 15, 11; after *כָּל* 1 Chron. 29, 3. 2 Chron. 30, 18 sq. 31, 19. Ezra 1, 5); so Ex. 18, 20. Jud. 8, 1. 20, 15. 1 Ki. 13, 12. 2 Ki. 3, 8. 2 Chron. 18, 23. Neh. 13, 23; after a pronominal subject, 1 Sam. 6, 9.

- e 2. If the nearer definition of a substantive or pronoun is effected by simple co-ordination of the relative clause, it may take the form—

(a) Of a noun-clause, e.g. 2 Sam. 20, 21 *a man of the hill country of Ephraim שְׁבַע שְׁמוֹ* *whose name was Sheba*; 1 Ki. 13, 2. Zech. 6, 12. Job 1, 6. 3, 15 *with princes לָהֶם זָהָב* *that had gold*; Ps. 11, 4. Prov. 22, 11; when referring to a noun-suffix, e.g. Ps. 49, 14 *זֶה דֶּרֶכָם בְּסֵל לָמוֹ* *this is the way of them who have (self-)confidence*.—On periphrases of this kind to express negative attributes, as in Job 38, 26 *עַל-אֲרֶץ לֹא-אִישׁ* *on a land where no man is*, see § 152. u, and comp. for this very short form of the relative clause, Gen. 15, 13 *בְּאֶרֶץ לֹא לָהֶם* *in a land that is not theirs*; Deut. 32, 17 *(לְשִׁירִים לֹא אֵלֶיהָ)*; Hab. 1, 6. Prov. 26, 17 *(לֹא-לֵוִי)*.

- f (b) Of a verbal clause.

Here we must distinguish the cases in which the retrospective pronoun—

(1) Is the subject of the relative clause, and is contained in the verb; so after a determinate substantive, Ps. 34, 9 *happy is the man יִתְקַדְּבוּ* *that trusteth in him*; Job 3, 3 *בַּלַּיְלָהָ אָמַר* *the night which said*; after *הוּא* 1 Sam. 6, 9. Is. 50, 9. Job 13, 19; after *כָּל* Ps. 71, 18; after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. Job 31, 12 *it is a fire (that) devoureth unto Abaddon*; Deut. 32, 17 *בֹּ*. Is. 55, 13. 56, 2. Ps. 68, 31. 78, 6. Prov. 30, 17. Lam. 1, 10. 2 Chron. 28, 9; referring to the preceding suffix in *הִנְנִי* Is. 28, 16, prop. *behold me, who have laid*, &c.; 29, 14. 38, 5. Ezek. 25, 7; depending on a vocative, Is. 54, 1;

¹ So Baumann, op. cit., p. 14 sq., following Böttcher, *Lehrbuch*, ii. 80.

on a noun-suffix (see letter *e* above), Ps. 16, 4. The relative clause is used in this way, especially to supply the place of an adjective, e.g. Gen. 49, 27 **וְיִטְרֹף יָמָאב** *a wolf that ravineth*, i.e. *a ravining wolf*; Is. 51, 12; to express a negative quality, e.g. Is. 40, 20. Hos. 4, 14 **לֹא יִדְבֹּן עַם** *an undiscerning people*.

Rem. Very frequently such relative sentences are attached to substantives which have the particle of comparison **כִּי**, e.g. Job 7, 2 **כִּי עֲבָד יִשְׁמַח צִלַּי** *as a servant that earnestly desireth the shadow*, &c.; Dent. 32, 11. Is. 62, 1. Jer. 23, 29. Hos. 6, 3. Ps. 42, 2. 83, 15. 125, 1. Job 9, 26. 11, 16; so also after **כִּמּוֹ** Ps. 58, 5; after a determinate substantive, e.g. Is. 53, 7. 61, 10 sq. Hab. 2, 14. Ps. 49, 13. 21; see also the examples under letter *h*. Sometimes it seems simpler in such cases, to take the verb directly as predicate to the preceding substantive, and to explain **כִּי** (for **כִּי אֲשֶׁר**; see *Comparative Clauses*, § 161. *b*) as a conjunction—a view which even Hupfeld was ready to accept, at least as regards Ps. 90, 5. 125, 1. Is. 53, 7. 61, 11. In all such cases, however, the Masora has provided rightly for the correct understanding of the passage by the use of greater or lesser distinctives; at the same time, in judging the accents, the rule mentioned in § 15. *e*, as to the change of certain distinctives into conjunctives, must not be forgotten.

(2) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun represents an accusative of the object, or would do so if not suppressed, as it usually is in such cases in relative clauses with **אֲשֶׁר**, cf. § 138. *b*. Examples with the retrospective pronoun are, Deut. 32, 17 **לֹא יָדְעוּם אֱלֹהִים** *gods whom they knew not* (see also the end of the verse); Jer. 5, 15; after a substantive with **כִּי** (see above, letter *g*), Jer. 23, 9. Job 13, 28. Without a retrospective pronoun, after a determinate substantive, Jud. 8, 1. 1 Ki. 13, 12 (2 Ki. 3, 8. 2 Chron. 18, 23); Ps. 33, 12 (preceded by a relative clause with **אֲשֶׁר**); Prov. 23, 8. Job 23, 17. 28, 1. Other examples of this kind, though the article is omitted according to poetic usage, are Is. 15, 7 **יִתְּרָה עֲשָׂה**, for which Jer. 48, 36 **יִתְּרָה עֲשָׂה** with the substantive in the construct state governing the relative clause, see § 130. *d*), Ps. 7, 16. 51, 10. Lam. 1, 21.—Without the retrospective pronoun, after an indeterminate substantive, e.g. Is. 6, 6 **רָפָחָה בְּמִלְחָמָה לָקַח מִעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** *a live coal which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar*; Ex. 15, 17. Is. 42, 16 (48, 17. Ps. 25, 12, all after **בְּיָדָהּ**; but Ps. 32, 8 **בְּיָדָהּ חִלָּהּ**); Is. 64, 2; Eccles. 10, 5 (in 6, 1 the same clause with **אֲשֶׁר**); moreover, in Jer. 14, 18 read with the LXX **אֶל־אֶרֶץ לֹא יָדְעוּ** *into a land that they know not*.

(3) The cases in which the retrospective pronoun is dependent on a preposition, or its place is taken by the adverb **שָׁם**, as in Jer. 2, 6 end. Thus after a determinate substantive, Ps. 18, 3 **צִוִּי אֶחָד־בָּנוּ**

my rock in which I take refuge; Ex. 18, 20. Is. 42, 1; in Job 3, 3 *α* also, the omission of the article with *אֶלֶּם* is only a poetic licence. After an indeterminate substantive, Jer. 2, 6, last clause but one; Ps. 32, 2.

k In this case also the retrospective word is not infrequently suppressed, giving rise to extremely short, bold expressions, such as Is. 51, 1 *look unto the rock אֶלֶּם הָצִרְתָּם* (whence) *ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit אֶלֶּם הָצִרְתָּם* (whence) *ye were digged*; Job 21, 27 *the devices (wherewith) ye act violently against me*.—A retrospective adverb is suppressed in Job 38, 19 *where is the way (to the place where) the light dwelleth?* cf. 38, 24.

l Rem. 1. The omission of the retrospective word occurs most frequently in relative clauses which are governed by the construct state of a preceding substantive (especially an expression of time) and hence are virtually in the genitive. In addition to the instances already given in § 130. *d*, cf. the following: after *אִיּוֹם* Lev. 7, 35. Ps. 56, 10; after *כִּי־אִיּוֹם* Jer. 36, 2; after simple *אִיּוֹם* Ps. 56, 4 (*אִיּוֹם אֶלֶּם* on the day when I am afraid); after *בְּעֵת הַחֵל* 2 Chron. 29, 27 (*בְּעֵת הַחֵל* at the time when the burnt offering began); 20, 22. 24, 11; after *לְעֵת* Deut. 32, 35. Job 6, 17; after *עַד־עֵת* Mic. 5, 2; after *מֵעַתָּה* Ps. 4, 8 *thou hast put gladness in my heart more than (their gladness) at the time (when) their corn and their wine are increased*. In a wider sense also Job 8, 12 *it is yet in its greenness, (while) it is not cut down*.

m 2. The agreement (§ 138. *d*) of the retrospective pronoun with a pronominal regens in the 1st or 2nd person also takes place in a simple co-ordinated relative clause in 1 Sam. 26, 14 *who art thou (that) criest?* Cf., however, Is. 63, 19 *we are become as they over whom אֲנִי not בָּנִי* thou never barest rule.

n 3. Occasionally—chiefly in poetic or otherwise elevated style—even independent relative clauses are simply co-ordinated with a regens, whereas we should expect them always to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun, on the analogy of the examples in § 138. *e*. The suppressed pronoun would stand—

(*a*) As subject, Is. 41, 24 *an abomination (is he) that chooseth you*; Job 30, 13, cf. § 152. *u*.

(*b*) As object, Is. 41, 2, with a retrospective pronoun; Mal. 2, 16 *וְכִסָּה* and him that covereth; Job 29, 12 *I delivered . . . the fatherless also, and him that had none to help him*.

(*c*) In the genitive governed by a substantive, Ex. 4, 13 *אֶלֶּם הָצִרְתָּם* send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send, i.e. by the hand of some one else; Ps. 65, 5 and Prov. 8, 32, verbal-clauses after *אֶלֶּם* O the happiness of the man, &c.; Ps. 81, 6. 141, 9.

Job 29, 16. Lam. 1, 14; after $\text{כִּלְ}^{\text{ל}}$ Gen. 39, 4, but in verse 5 $\text{כִּלְ}^{\text{ל}} \text{אֶת־} \text{אִשְׁרָ}^{\text{ל}}$; Ex. 9, 4; verbal-clauses after $\text{כִּלְ}^{\text{ל}}$ 1 Chron. 29, 3. 30, 18 sq. 31, 19. Ezra 1, 5.

(d) Governed by a preposition; so verbal-clauses after $\text{אֲחֵרִי}^{\text{ל}}$ Jer. 2, 8; after $\text{אֶל־}^{\text{ל}}$ (=to the place where), 1 Chron. 15, 12, but Ex. 23, 20 before the same verb $\text{אֶל־הַפָּקִידִים}^{\text{ל}}$; after $\text{בִּי}^{\text{ל}}$ Jer. 8, 11. 2 Chron. 1, 4 (=in the place where); after $\text{לִי}^{\text{ל}}$ Is. 65, 1 $\text{לִי לֹא שָׁאֲלוּ}^{\text{ל}}$ by them that asked not for me . . . $\text{לִי לֹא בִקְשׁוּ}^{\text{ל}}$ them that sought me not; Ezek. 13, 3 that which they have not seen; after $\text{עַל}^{\text{ל}}$ Ps. 119, 136, cf. § 158. b; after $\text{עַד}^{\text{ל}}$ 2 Chron. 16, 9.—A noun-clause follows $\text{לִי}^{\text{ל}}$ in Neh. 8, 10¹.

§ 156. Circumstantial Clauses.

1. The statement of the particular circumstances under which α a subject appears as performing some action, or under which an action (or an occurrence) is accomplished, is made especially (apart from relative clauses, see § 155) by means of noun-clauses connected by *Wāw* with a following subject (see further on this kind of *circumstantial clause* in § 141. e), and by verbal-clauses (see § 142. d). Very frequently, however, such statements of the particular circumstances are subordinated to the main clause by being simply attached without *Wāw*, either as noun-clauses, sometimes extremely short (see letter c), or as verbal-clauses (see letters d-g).

Rem. Among relative clauses of this kind the commonest are the various noun-clauses, which are most closely subordinated to a preceding substantive without $\text{אֲשֶׁר}^{\text{ל}}$, e.g. Gen. 16, 12; also statements of weight, Gen. 24, 22; of name, Job 1, 1 (also introduced by $\text{אֲשֶׁר}^{\text{ל}}$ Gen. 24, 29. 1 Sam. 1, 1, and elsewhere, or $\text{אֲשֶׁר}^{\text{ל}}$ Gen. 16, 1. 22, 24, and elsewhere); of a condition of body, Jud. 1, 7, and others.—Noun-clauses which begin with *wāw* and the *predicate* have a somewhat more independent character than those introduced by *wāw* and the *subject*² (Gen. 19, 1, &c.). The former, however, are also to be regarded as circumstantial clauses, in so far as they describe a *condition* which is simultaneous with the principal action; thus Is. 3, 7 *I will not be an healer*, $\text{לֹא אֶחְיֶה}^{\text{ל}}$ $\text{אֶת־בֵּיתִי}^{\text{ל}}$ $\text{אֵין}^{\text{ל}}$ *while in my house is neither bread nor clothing*; Is. 6, 6 (Amos 7, 7); 2 Sam. 13, 18. 16, 1.

¹ An analogous instance in Aramaic is Ezra 5, 14 *to one whose name was Sheshbazzar*.

² In Deut. 32, 31 this form of sequence appears to be selected for another purpose, and indeed our enemies are judges thereof, with *wāw* *emphatic*; to take it as a circumstantial clause is too artificial.

- c 2. Characteristic examples of circumstantial *noun*-clauses are Gen. 12, 8 and *pitched his tent* בֵּית־אֵל מִיָּמִין וְהָעֵץ מִסְּמֵרָם *with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east*; Num. 22, 24. 2 Sam. 18, 14 *through the heart of Absalom*, חַי עוֹדְנִי while *he was yet alive*; Jer. 30, 6. Ezek. 9, 2 (comp. Cant. 3, 8). Nah. 3, 8. Zech. 14, 5. 2 Chron. 23, 10; with the predicate preceding, e.g. 1 Sam. 26, 13. Ps. 32, 8. — In Gen. 41, 29 a noun-clause serves to announce a future condition. — We may also include here certain set phrases, as אֶל-פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים *face to face* (prop. while *face* was turned *towards face*), Gen. 32, 31. Ex. 33, 11. Deut. 34, 10, and elsewhere¹; so also *to cast oneself down*, אָרְצָה אֶפְסִים *the face* being turned *to the earth*, Gen. 19, 1, and elsewhere (for אָרְצָה אֶפְסִים we find אָרְץ in 1 Ki. 1, 31. Is. 49, 23)². — Comp. finally the formula אִם-עַל-בָּנִים *mother with children*, Gen. 32, 12; comp. Hos. 10, 14 and § 119. aa, note 3.

Rem. On circumlocutions of this kind to express negative attributes by means of short noun-clauses (complete or incomplete), comp. § 152. u.

- d 3. As circumstantial *verbal*-clauses³, we find (1) sometimes affirmative clauses (see below), but far more frequently (2) negative clauses (see letter f), and among these (3) a certain number of expressions which may be regarded simply as equivalent to negative adverbial ideas (see letter g).

Examples of (1) Is. 5, 11 *woe unto them, that tarry late in the evening*, יִינְי יְהִלִּים *while wine inflames them*; Is. 30, 31. Jer. 7, 26. 20, 15. Ps. 4, 3. 5, 12. 62, 5. The circumstantial verbal-clause is used to particularize an action which has before been expressed generally, e.g. Gen. 44, 12. 48, 14 = *crossing his hands*; Deut. 2, 27. Jud. 6, 19; antithetically, 1 Ki. 13, 18 לִי כַחַשׁ *where-with however he lied unto him*. The verbal-clause seems to assign a reason in Ps. 7, 7 צִוִּיתָ כִּלְשָׁם *since thou hast commanded judgement*; a consequence in Ps. 103, 5.

- e Rem. On the cases in which an imperfect in the sense of a final clause is subordinated to a verb of motion (generally יָצָא), see § 120. c. Comp. also

¹ The expression הִתְרַאָּה פָּנִים *to look one another in the face* (i.e. to contend in combat) 2 Ki. 14, 8. 11. 2 Chron. 25, 17. 21 is probably only a shortened form for הִתְרַאָּה פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים.

² That אָרְצָה (אָרָץ) is really to be regarded as a virtual predicate to אֶפְסִים, and not אֶפְסִים as a *casus instrumenti*, is seen from Is. 49, 23, where אָרָץ אֶפְסִים precedes the verb.

³ Some examples of these have been already discussed in another connexion above, § 120. a-c.

examples like Is. 5, 11 *a that they may follow strong drink*; Hab. 3, 16 יִנְדְּנֵנִי *that he may invade them*; Job 16, 8, 30, 28.

Of (2), subordinate verbal-clauses with לֹא (in English usually rendered by *f* without and the gerund, if the subject be the same as in the principal clause), e. g. Lev. 1, 17 לֹא יִבְדִּיל *without dividing it asunder*; Job 31, 34; לֹא with the perfect is so used in Gen. 44, 4. Ex. 34, 28. 1 Sam. 30, 2. Job 20, 26 (*without its being blown upon it*). With a different subject, equivalent to a consecutive clause in English, e. g. Is. 27, 9 לֹא יִקְמוּ *so that they shall rise up no more*.—Moreover, verbal-clauses in the same sense (*without doing, &c.*) are frequently connected by וְלֹא; comp. 1 Sam. 20, 2. Job 24, 22. 42, 3; in a concessive sense, Is. 33, 1. Ps. 44, 18.

Of (3), comp. לֹא יָדַע (prop. *he knows it not*) *unawares*, Ps. 35, 8. Prov. 5, 6 לֹא יִחְסֹל *unsparingly*, Is. 30, 14 (after an infinitive absolute); Hab. 1, 17. Job 6, 10 (but לֹא יִחְסֹל Job 16, 13. 27, 22; see letter *f* at the end); לֹא כָּהֲרוּ (prop. *they hide not*) *openly*, Is. 3, 9 (but Job 15, 18 כָּהֲרוּ); בְּלִי חֶשֶׁךְ (prop. *he restrains not*) *unceasingly*, Is. 14, 6; בְּלִי-יָפוּט Job 41, 15 (Ps. 93, 1 בְּלִי-יָפוּט) and לֹא יָפוּט Is. 40, 20 equivalent to *without tottering, immovably*; comp. also לֹא אֶמְעָר *without wavering*, Ps. 26, 1.

§ 157. Object-Clauses.

Clauses which depend on a transitive verb, especially on what are *a* called the *verba cordis*, i. e. verbs denoting any mental act, such as *to see, to hear, to know, to perceive, to believe, to remember, to forget, to say, to think, &c.*, may be subordinated to the governing verb without the help of a conjunction by simple juxtaposition (§ 120. *a*), or they may be co-ordinated with it either with or without *wāw copulative* (§ 120. *d-h*). As a rule, however, the objective clause is introduced by the conjunction כִּי *that*, less frequently by אֲשֶׁר *that*.

Examples:—

(*a*) Object-clauses without a conjunction. Besides the passages mentioned in § 120 (especially under letter *c*) there are a number of examples, in which a clause depending on a *verbum dicendi* or *sentienti* (the *oratio obliqua* of the Latin and English Grammar) is added in the form of an independent noun-clause or verbal-clause; e. g. Gen. 12, 13 אָמַרְתִּי אָחֹתִי אֵת *say, I pray thee, thou art my sister*; Zech. 8, 23 (after שָׁמַע); Ps. 9, 21 (after יָדַע); verbal-clauses, e. g. Ps. 50, 21 thou thoughtest כְּמוֹד הָיִיתִי אֲהִיָּה *I was altogether like thyself*; Gen. 41, 15. Jud. 9, 48 what ye have seen me do; Is. 48, 8. Hos. 7, 2.

(*b*) Object-clauses introduced by כִּי, e. g. Gen. 6, 5 וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה כִּי רָבָה רָעַת *and the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great, &c.*—Direct narration also is very frequently introduced by כִּי (analogous to the *ὅτι recitativum*; frequently, indeed, with the secondary idea of a particle of asseveration, as in Gen. 26, 9. 27, 20), e. g. Gen. 21, 30. 22, 16 sq. 26, 22. 29, 32. 37, 35. Jos. 2, 24, &c., even when the direct narration is not expressly indicated, Gen. 4, 25.

32, 31. 41, 51 sq. Ex. 18, 4.—On the expression of a second object by means of a clause introduced by *כִּי*, see § 117. *h*¹.

- c* (c) Object-clauses introduced by *אֲשֶׁר*, e.g. Est. 3, 4 *כִּי־יֹאמְרוּ־לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה* *יְהוָה* for he had told them that he was a Jew; 1 Sam. 18, 15. Ezek. 20, 26. Eccles. 8, 12², even before direct narration, 1 Sam. 15, 20. 2 Sam. 1, 4. Somewhat frequently *אֲשֶׁר* is preceded by the *nota accusativi* *אֲתָּ* (equivalent to the circumstance, the fact, that), e.g. Jos. 2, 10. 1 Sam. 24, 11. 19. 2 Sam. 11, 20. Is. 38, 3, but in Gen. 30, 29. Deut. 29, 15 equivalent to the way in which.

§ 158. Causal Clauses.

- a* A complete clause, which assigns the reason for statements, demands, threats, &c., sometimes follows with the simple *wāw* copulative, e.g. Ps. 60, 13 *give us help against the adversary, and (for) vain is the help of man*; Gen. 22, 12. Ex. 23, 9. Job 22, 12, perhaps also Ps. 7, 10; or even without *Wāw*, e.g. Gen. 17, 14. As a rule, however, special conjunctions in various combinations are used to introduce causal clauses.
- b* The most common causal conjunctions are *יַעַן* Is. 3, 16 and elsewhere, and *אֲשֶׁר* *יַעַן* because, prop. on account of the fact that; both, however, may also be shortened to the simple *יַעַן* Num. 20, 12 and elsewhere, or to *כִּי* because, Gen. 3, 14. 17 and elsewhere, or to *אֲשֶׁר* Gen. 30, 18. 31, 49. 34, 13. 27. 1 Sam. 15, 15. 20, 42. 26, 16. 23. 1 Ki. 3, 19. 8, 33. Hos. 14, 4. Zech. 1, 15; also *בְּאֲשֶׁר* Gen. 39, 9. 23. On the other hand, the simple *יַעַן* is sometimes repeated for emphasis, *יַעַן וְיַעַן* (something like the German *sintemal und alldieweil*) Lev. 26, 43. Ezek. 13, 10 (without *י* 36, 3); also *עַל־אֲשֶׁר* 2 Sam. 3, 30, and *עַל־כִּי* Deut. 31, 17. Jud. 3, 12. Mal. 2, 14 *on the ground that*; *עַל־דִּבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר* because of the circumstance that, Deut. 23, 5; *עַל־פְּלִארוֹת אֲשֶׁר* for this very cause that, Jer. 3, 8. But just as the simple *יַעַן* is used for *אֲשֶׁר* *יַעַן*, so also the simple *עַל־* with the perfect stands for *עַל־אֲשֶׁר* Ps. 119, 136. Ezra 3, 11; comp. *עַל־פְּלִי* Gen. 31, 20

¹ Instead of a complete objective clause we sometimes find a kind of accusative and infinitive construction, especially after *נָתַן* (prop. to give up) in the sense of to allow, e.g. Num. 21, 23 *עָבַר בְּגִבְלוֹ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל* and *Sihon did not suffer Israel to pass through his border*; 20, 21; followed by an infinitive with *ל*, e.g. Gen. 20, 6. 31, 7. Ex. 3, 19. Comp. also the analogous examples in Deut. 28, 56 (after *נָסַח* to venture; see § 113. *d*); Jud. 11, 20 (after *הֶאֱמִין* to trust); 1 Ki. 19, 4 (after *שָׁאַל* to request).

² In Jer. 28, 9 a subject-clause is thus introduced by *אֲשֶׁר* instead of the usual *כִּי*.

³ Also *כִּי־עַל־כֵּן* prop. for therefore, Gen. 18, 5. 19, 8. 33, 10. 38, 26. Num. 10, 31. 14, 43. 2 Sam. 18, 20 *Q'el*, and *אֲשֶׁר עַל־כֵּן* Job 34, 27 always mean forasmuch as.

and *כִּי* Deut. 28, 55, both with the perfect, equivalent to *because . . . not*.—Comp. further, *אֲשֶׁר* Gen. 22, 18. 26, 5. 2 Sam. 12, 6, all with the perfect, and *כִּי* (2 Sam. 12, 10 with the perfect; Amos 4, 12 with the imperfect) prop. *in return for the fact that*; similarly again the simple *עַקֵּב* Num. 14, 24 with the perfect, and Deut. 7, 12. 8, 20 with the imperfect; finally, *מֵאַשֶׁר* Is. 43, 4 *arising from the fact that, = because*; *אֲשֶׁר* 1 Sam. 26, 21 and elsewhere, and *כִּי* Deut. 4, 37. Prov. 1, 29 *for the reason that*.

Rem. 1. The preposition *עַל* (*because of, on account of*) with the infinitive (§ 114. c) is frequently used as the equivalent of a full causal clause; comp., e.g. Amos 1, 3. 13. 2, 1. 6. Such a construction with the infinitive may, however, according to § 114. r, be continued by means of a finite verb, in which case *עַל* governs the verb as a conjunction; e.g. Amos 1, 9 *וְלֹא זָכְרוּ . . . עַל־הַסִּידִים* *because they delivered up . . . and remembered not, &c.*; 1, 11. 2, 4; without *Wāw*, Is. 30, 14.

2. The choice of tense is regulated by the general principles stated in § 106 sqq., viz. the perfect (comp. especially § 106. f) refers to causes already brought fully into effect, the imperfect to those which may contingently arise; comp. e.g. Deut. 7, 12. 8, 20. 1 Ki. 8, 33, where the imperfect leaves the possibility still open that the persons addressed will perhaps escape the threatened punishments by avoiding disobedience.—Comp. further, § 111. h on the imperfect consecutive, and § 112. nn on the perfect consecutive in the apodosis to causal clauses.

§ 159. Conditional Sentences.

Comp. H. Ferguson, 'The Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew' (*Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.*, Middletown, Conn., June and September, 1882).—P. Friedrich, *Die hebr. Conditionalsätze*, Königsberg, 1884 (Inaug.-Dissertation).—Driver, *Use of the Tenses*, 3rd ed., p. 174 sqq.

1. The great variety of construction in conditional sentences is owing to the fact that it frequently depends on the subjective judgment of the speaker, whether he wishes a condition to be regarded as *capable of fulfilment* (absolutely, or at least possibly), thus including those already fulfilled, or as *incapable of fulfilment*. On this distinction depends the choice both of the conditional particle to be used (see below), and especially (as also in Greek and Latin) of the tense. The use of the latter is naturally determined according to the general principles laid down in § 106 sqq.¹ In the following sketch, for the sake of clearness, conditional sentences *without* conditional particles will be first discussed (letter δ), and afterwards sentences *with* these particles (letter I).

¹ It may, moreover, happen that a different idea is introduced in the apodosis, from that with which the protasis started—a source of many further variations.

- b 2. The relation between condition and consequence may be expressed, as in English, by the simple juxtaposition of two clauses. At the same time, it is to be observed in general, as a fundamental rule (in accordance with the original character of the two tenses), that the *imperfect*, with its equivalents (the jussive, cohortative, imperative, perfect consecutive, and participle), is used to express a condition and consequence which are regarded as being *capable of fulfilment* in present or future time, while the *perfect* represents a condition already fulfilled in the past, and its consequence as an accomplished fact. The other use of the perfect—to represent conditions regarded as *impossible*—occurs only in connexion with particles.

Examples:—

- c (a) *Imperfect* (comp. § 107. x) in protasis and apodosis, Jos. 22, 18. Ps. 104, 28 sqq. וְלִקְטָתוּ לָהֶם וְיִתְּנוּ אֵלֶיךָ if thou givest unto them, they gather, &c.; Ps. 139, 18. Job 20, 24. Eccles. 1, 18. Neh. 1, 8; with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis, Jud. 13, 12; with the jussive, Job 10, 16; with the cohortative, Prov. 1, 23; with the perfect, Is. 26, 10 (yet will he not learn righteousness; the apodosis forcibly denies what the imperfect in the protasis had represented as still conceivable; comp. Hos. 8, 12); with the perfect consecutive, Gen. 47, 25. Ex. 33, 5; with the protasis suppressed, Job 5, 8 (see § 107. x).
- d (b) *Jussive* in protasis (comp. § 109. h, z) and apodosis, Ps. 104, 20 וְשָׁתְּחֹשֶׁךְ וְיִהְיֶה לְיָלִילָהּ if thou makest darkness, it is night; imperfect in the apodosis, Ps. 104, 29 b. Also in Ex. 7, 9 וְיָהִי לְחֹתָן יְהִי it shall become a serpent, is the apodosis to a suppressed protasis if thou cast it down; so in 2 Ki. 5, 10 וְיִשָּׁב is the apodosis to a protasis if thou wash, contained in what precedes.
- e (c) *Cohortative* (see § 108. e) in the protasis; perfect in the apodosis, Ps. 40, 6; imperfect consecutive, Job 19, 18 וְאָמְרוּ חֲבֵרָיו if I arise, they speak against me; on the cohortative in the apodosis, comp. § 108. f.
- f (d) *Imperfect consecutive* in the protasis (§ 111. x), Ps. 139, 11 וְאָמַר if I say, &c. (with a noun-clause as the apodosis); with a frequentative perfect consecutive in the apodosis, 1 Sam. 2, 16.
- g (e) *Perfect consecutive* in the protasis and apodosis (see the examples, § 112. k and l), Gen. 44, 22 וְנָתַת אָבִיו וְנָתַת אָבִיו וְנָתַת אָבִיו and should he leave his father, his father would die; 9, 15. 44, 29. Ex. 4, 14, 12, 13. 1 Sam. 16, 2, 19, 3. 2 Sam. 13, 28. 1 Ki. 8, 30; with frequentative perfects, Ex. 16, 21 (referring to the past, Jer. 20, 9); with imperfect in the apodosis (being separated from the *Wāw* by לָא), Num. 23, 20.

¹ On the termination ׀ comp. § 47. m. In verse 28 b also וְיִשָּׁב is probably to be explained from its immediately preceding the greater pause. These terminations in verses 28–30 and Ps. 139, 18 can scarcely have any connexion with the conditional sentence, although it is strange that ׀ in Num. 32, 23 appears after וְאָמַר even in the protasis. In Num. 16, 29, 32, 20 ׀ before ׀ (as in Job 31, 10 in the apodosis) is to be explained from the dislike of hiatus.

Job 5, 24; separated by an infinitive absolute, 1 Ki. 2, 37; an interrogative clause in the apodosis, Lev. 10, 19; a noun-clause, Ps. 37, 10. Job 7, 21.

(f) *A simple perfect* (to represent actions which are to be regarded as completed) ^h in the protasis and apodosis, Prov. 18, 22 מָצָא אִשָּׁה טוֹבָה כָּמוֹן מָצָא חַיִּים *has one found a wife he has found a good thing*; 24, 10; an imperfect in the apodosis, Job 19, 4. 23, 10; an imperfect consecutive, Ex. 20, 25. Prov. 11, 2. Job 3, 25. 23, 13 d. 29, 11; an interrogative clause, Num. 12, 14. Job 7, 20 *if I have sinned* (prop., well, now I have sinned!) *what can I do unto thee?* 21, 31. 35, 6. Amos 3, 8; a noun-clause, Job 27, 19.

(g) *A participle as casus pendens* (comp. § 143. d, and the sections of the Grammar ⁱ there referred to) or a complete noun-clause in the protasis; the apodosis mostly introduced by *wāw apodosis*, e. g. Prov. 23, 24 כֹּהֵן וְיִשְׁמַח בּוֹ *if one begetteth a wise child, he shall have joy of him*; with perfect frequentative in the apodosis, 1 Sam. 2, 13 and elsewhere; but also with a simple imperfect, e. g. Ex. 21, 12 (comp. § 112. n); with an interrogative imperfect, 2 Ki. 7, 2. 19; with an interrogative perfect, Jud. 6, 13.

(h) *Infinitive with preposition* (also as the equivalent of a conditional clause) ^k in the protasis, and a perfect consecutive in the apodosis (comp. § 112. mm), e. g. 2 Sam. 7, 14 sqq. בְּחַטָּאתָיו וְלִכְבֹּתָיו יִצְחָק *if he commit iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men*; Ex. 34, 34 sq. (with imperfect, followed by perfects frequentative in the apodosis).

Rem. On the expression of condition and consequence by means of two co-ordinate imperatives, see § 110. f.

3. Particles used to introduce conditional sentences are אִם (for ^l which in the later and latest Books sometimes וְ, see below, letter w) and וְ¹ (1 Sam. 14, 30. Is. 63, 19 לֹא; Eccles. 6, 6. Est. 7, 4 אִלּוּ, from וְ אִם) *if*, negative לֹא אִם and לֹא אִלּוּ *unless*; כִּי *supposing that* (Lat. *ut*), *in case that*, sometimes used almost in the same sense as אִם. With regard to the difference between אִם (לֹא אִם) and וְ (לֹא וְ), it is to be observed, as a fundamental rule, that אִם is used if the condition be regarded either as already fulfilled, or if it, together with its consequence, be thought of as possibly (or probably) occurring in the present or future. In the former case, אִם is followed by the perfect, in the latter (corresponding to the Greek *ἐὰν* with the present subjunctive) by the imperfect or its equivalent (frequently in the apodosis also). On the other hand, וְ (לֹא וְ) is used when the condition is to be represented as *not fulfilled* in the past, or as *not capable of fulfilment* in the present or future, and the consequence accordingly as not having occurred or never occurring. In the former case, וְ and לֹא וְ are necessarily followed by the perfect (mostly also in the

¹ On וְ cf. Kohler in Geiger's *Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben*, vi (1868), p. 21 sqq.

apodosis) corresponding to the Greek *ei* with the indicative of an historic tense, and the Latin imperfect or pluperfect subjective. In the latter case (which is extremely rare) the perfect, or the participle, or even the imperfect, may be used.

- 111 Rem. Since it again frequently depends on the subjective judgment of the speaker (see letter *a*), whether a condition is to be regarded as possible or impossible, we cannot wonder that the distinction between DN and לִּי is not always consistently observed. Although naturally לִּי and לִּי־לִי cannot take the place of DN and לִּי־DN (on the strange use of לִּי in Gen. 50, 15, see below), yet conversely DN is sometimes used where לִּי would certainly be expected; comp. e.g. Ps. 50, 12. 137, 5. 139, 8. Hos. 9, 12 (comp. verse 11). These examples, indeed (DN with the imperfect), may without difficulty be explained from the fact that the connexion of לִּי with the imperfect was evidently avoided, because the imperfect by its nature indicates a still unfinished action, and consequently (as opposed to לִּי) a still open possibility. But DN is also used for לִּי in connexion with the perfect, especially when an imprecation is attached by the apodosis to the condition introduced by DN , e.g. Ps. 7, 4 sqq. $\text{לִּי־נִשְׁפָּטִי וְאֶת־נַפְשִׁי יִקַּח$ if I have done this . . . let the enemy pursue my soul, &c., comp. Job 31, 9 sqq. The speaker assumes for a moment as possible and even actual, that which he really rejects as inconceivable, in order to invoke the most severe punishment on himself, if it should prove to be the case.

On the frequent addition of an infinitive absolute to the verb in clauses with DN , see § 113. *o* above.

Examples:—

- 11 A. DN 1. with *perfect* in the protasis to express conditions, &c., which have been completely fulfilled in the past or which will be completely fulfilled in the future (the perfect is here equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, § 106. *o*). The apodosis¹ takes—
- (a) A *perfect* also, e.g. Prov. 9, 12 $\text{לִּי־חִכְמָה וְחִכְמָה לִּי$ if thou art wise, thou art wise for thyself; Ps. 73, 15 (see below on לִּי).
- (b) *Imperfect*, e.g. Deut. 32, 41 $\text{לִּי־שִׁנְאוֹתִי$ if I whet my glittering sword . . . אֶשְׁבֵּי I will render vengeance, &c.; Job 9, 15 sq. and 30 (in both cases we should expect לִּי rather than DN ; so also Ps. 44, 21 sq., with an interrogative imperfect in the apodosis); Job 11, 13 (the apodosis is in verse 15).
- (c) *Jussive* (or *optative*), e.g. Job 31, 9 sqq. (see letter *m* above); Gen. 18, 3.
- o (d) *Perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112. *gg*), e.g. Gen. 43, 9 $\text{לִּי־אֶת־נַפְשִׁי וְגִ' הֵבִי־אֹתוֹ$ if I bring him not . . . then I shall have sinned, &c.; Jud. 16, 17. 2 Sam. 15, 33. 2 Ki. 7, 4. On the other hand, e.g. Gen. 47, 6. Mic. 5, 7. Job 7, 4 refer to actions already completed; in Gen. 38, 9 and Num. 21, 9 the perfect with לִּי is a perfect frequentative and refers to past time.

¹ We are not here concerned with the fact that the logical apodosis (the consequence of the condition) is sometimes mentioned before the condition; as in Gen. 18, 28. 30. Jud. 11, 10. Ps. 63, 6 sq. 137, 6, and according to Dillmann Is. 4, 4.

(e) *Imperfect consecutive* (see § 111. q), e.g. Job 8, 4 *if thy children have sinned* (חַטְּאוּ) . . . , וַיִּשְׁלַחֵם *he has delivered them*, &c.

(f) *Imperative*, e.g. Gen. 50, 4 וְדַבַּרְתָּ אֵלַי אֲנִי אֶפְעֶה לְךָ אֵינִי אֶפְעֶה לְךָ *if now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, &c.*; the imperative precedes in Gen. 47, 16 and Job 38, 4, 18.

(g) A (complete or incomplete) noun-clause, e.g. Jer. 14, 18 (a vivid realization of the future) *if I have gone forth into the field (= if I go, &c.), then, behold, the slain with the sword!* &c.; Prov. 24, 14 (וַיִּשָּׁא with *wāw apodosis*).

2. **אִם** with *imperfect* in the protasis, to express what is possible in the present *q* or future, as well as (according to § 107. b) what has continued or been repeated in the past. The apodosis takes—

(a) The *perfect*, e.g. Num. 32, 23 וְאִם לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ כֵן הִנֵּה הָמָאָתָם *but if ye will not do so, behold, ye have sinned*; here the apodosis represents the time when the consequence has already taken place; so also Job 20, 12-14. On the other hand, Num. 16, 29 (as also 1 Sam. 6, 9 and 1 Ki. 22, 28) is a case of a pregnant construction, *if these men die as all men die, then* (it will follow from this) *the Lord hath not sent me*.

(b) The *imperfect*, e.g. 2 Ki. 7, 4 אִם יִחְיֶינָה נַחֲיָה *if they save us alive, we shall live*, &c.; Gen. 13, 16, 18, 28, 30, 28, 20 sqq. Ex. 20, 25 (the second imperfect is equivalent to a jussive); Is. 1, 18, 10, 22, Amos 9, 2-4, Ps. 50, 12 (where **אִם** ironically represents an impossibility as possible); Job 8, 5 sq. (with the insertion of a second condition in the form of a noun-clause); 9, 3, 20, 14, 7; a frequentative imperfect referring to the past, Gen. 31, 8 אִם-כֵּן יֹאמַר *if (ever) he said thus* . . . , וַיִּלְדוּ *then they bare* . . . ; Ex. 40, 37. In Gen. 42, 37 the consequence (on **חֲמִיּוֹת** cf. § 107. s) precedes the condition.

(c) The *jussive* (or *optative*), e.g. Ps. 137, 5; comp. § 109. h.

(d) The *cohortative*, e.g. Gen. 13, 9, Job 31, 7; comp. § 108. f.

(e) The *perfect consecutive* (see the examples in § 112. ff and gg), e.g. 1 Sam. 8, 20, 6 וְאִם-פָּלַךְ יִפְקְדֵנִי אָבִיךָ וְאִם-רָחַק *if thy father miss me at all, then shalt thou say, &c.*; Gen. 24, 41, Jud. 4, 20; with a frequentative perfect consecutive, Gen. 31, 8 *if he said* (as often happened) . . . , *then, &c.*

(f) The *imperfect consecutive*; so perhaps Ps. 59, 16, if וַיִּלְכֹּט is to be explained according to § 111. t.

(g) The *imperative*, e.g. Gen. 31, 59, 1 Sam. 20, 21 (with *wāw apodosis*, but in verse 22 simply **וְלֵךְ**). 21, 10, Job 33, 5.

(h) A noun-clause, e.g. Gen. 4, 7, Ps. 139, 8, Job 8, 6, 31, 26 sq.

3. **אִם** with *cohortative*, e.g. Gen. 30, 31; comp. the passages in § 108. e.

4. **אִם** with *infinitive*, Job 9, 27 אִם-אֶמְצָא *prop. if my saying is* (probably, however, we should read אֶמְצָא).

5. **אִם** with a noun-clause, e.g. Deut. 5, 22 (in the apodosis a perfect with *wāw apodosis*), Gen. 27, 46, Jud. 9, 15 (imperative in the apodosis); 11, 9 (imperfect in the apodosis); 2 Sam. 12, 8 (cohortative in the apodosis); Hos. 12, 12; especially if the subject of the conditional clause be a personal pronoun. In an affirmative sentence this pronoun is often joined to וַיִּשָּׁא, in a negative sentence to וַיִּשָּׁא (comp. on both, § 100. o), while the predicate (cf. § 116. q) is represented by a participle, usually expressing the future, e.g. Jud. 6, 36 sq. אִם-יִשְׁמַע מִלִּשְׁמִיעַ

if thou wilt save, &c.; Gen. 24, 49 **וְאִם-יַעֲשֶׂהְכֶם עִשָּׂיִם** if ye will deal, &c.; 1 Sam. 23, 23. In Gen. 24, 42 sq. the condition is expressed in a more humble form by the addition of **נָא**. With **אִין** Gen. 43, 5 **וְאִם-יִשְׁלַח מִשְׁלָחַךְ** but if thou wilt not send, &c.; 20, 7 (with imperative in the apodosis); Ex. 8, 17. 9, 2 sq. 1 Sam. 19, 11 (all with a participle also in the apodosis). But **וְשֵׁ** and **וְאִין** may also be used after **דִּם** without a suffix; thus **וְשֵׁ** Gen. 23, 8. 1 Sam. 20, 8. 2 Ki. 9, 15, and elsewhere, **וְאִין-דִּם** (if it be not the case) Gen. 30, 1. Ex. 32, 32. Jud. 9, 15. 2 Ki. 2, 10; comp. also **וְאִם-כֵּן** if it be so, Gen. 25, 22.

w B. **הִן** if, according to the common opinion originally identical with **הִן** behold! Probably, however, **הִן** if, is a pure Aramaism, and since the Aramaic word never has the meaning *behold*, it is at least improbable that it had originally any connexion with **הִן** or **הִנֵּה**. Comp. Ex. 8, 22. Is. 54, 15. Jer. 3, 1. 2 Chron. 7, 13. But in Job 12, 14 and 23, 8 the meaning *behold* is to be preferred.

x C. **לִי** if, **לְאִלֵּי** (לְאִלֵּי) if not.

1. With *perfect* in the protasis and apodosis (comp. § 106. *g*), e.g. 1 Sam. 14, 30 **וְהָיָה כִּי לֹא אָכַל אָבֶל הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** how much more, if the people had eaten freely . . . , had there not been a great (= much greater) slaughter? &c.; Jud. 8, 19; **וְאִין** is used in the same sense as **לִי** in Est. 7, 4, comp. Eccles. 6, 6 (with a question in the apodosis).—With the *perfect* in protasis and apodosis after **לְאִלֵּי** Gen. 31, 42. 43, 10. Jud. 14, 18. 1 Sam. 25, 34. 2 Sam. 2, 27. Is. 1, 9. On the other hand, in Deut. 32, 29 **לִי** with a *perfect* is followed by an *imperfect* in the apodosis, *if they were wise, they would understand this*; in Mic. 2, 11 by a *perfect consecutive*.

y 2. With *imperfect* after **לְאִלֵּי** Deut. 32, 27, **אֲנִי** probably as the *modus rei repetitae*, *were it not that I ever and again feared*, &c.; so also the *imperfect* after **לִי** with the apodosis suppressed, Gen. 50, 15 *supposing that Joseph should hate us*; since, according to the context, the danger was real, the use of **לִי** here is strange; conversely in other cases, e.g. Ps. 73, 15. Job 9, 15 sq. 30, **לִי** would be more natural than **דִּם**.

z 3. A noun-clause occurs after **לִי** 2 Sam. 18, 12. 2 Ki. 3, 14. Ps. 81, 14, all with *imperfect* in the apodosis; Job 16, 4 **וְלִי יֵשׁ**, with *cohortative* in the apodosis.

D. **כִּי** supposing that, if:—

aa 1. **כִּי** with *perfect* in the protasis, e.g. Num. 5, 20 **וְאָתָּה כִּי שָׁמַיִת** but thou, if thou hast gone astray, &c.; with a frequentative *perfect consecutive* in the apodosis, Job 7, 13 sq.; with an *imperfect consecutive*, Job 22, 29.

bb 2. **כִּי** with *imperfect* in the protasis, e.g. Ps. 23, 4 **יָמֹךְ כִּי-אֵלֶךְ** yea, though I walk (have to walk) . . . , I will fear no (לֹא-אֵירָא) evil; 37, 24; Ex. 21, 2 **וְהָיָה כִּי תִקְנֶה עֶבֶד עִבְרִי** if thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve (but in verses 3-5 a series of definite conditions with definite consequences is introduced by **דִּם**; so also the **כִּי** in verse 7 is followed in verses 8-11 by the special cases with **דִּם**; cf. also verse 17 sqq.); comp. Gen. 4, 24. 24, 41. Job 38, 5; with a *perfect consecutive* in the apodosis, Gen. 32, 18 sq. Ex. 18, 16; with a noun-clause, Is. 1, 15.

3. **כִּי** with a noun-clause (and *imperfect* in the apodosis), 2 Sam. 19, 8.

REMARKS.

1. In 2 Ki. 5, 13 the particle **אֲבִי** (Masora **אָבִי**, probably in the sense of *my father*) appears exceptionally for **לִי**; its meaning here is unquestionable, but its origin is obscure. Comp. the exhaustive discussion of Delitzsch and Wetzstein on Job 34, 36, where this **אֲבִי** appears to be used as a desiderative particle.— Sometimes when one case has been already discussed, another of the same character is added by means of **אוֹ** or, e.g. Ex. 21, 36 **אוֹ נִדְרָע וְג'** or (another possible case) *it is known that, &c.*, i.e. *but if it be known, &c.*, LXX *ἐὰν δὲ*, Vulg. *sin autem*; comp. Lev. 4, 23. 28. 5, 1. 25, 49. 2 Sam. 18, 13; with a following imperfect, Ezek. 14, 17 sq.—On the hypothetical use of **אִם** (which is interchangeable with **כִּי** in other senses also) Lev. 4, 22 (in verses 3 and 27 **אִם**), Deut. 11, 27 (verse 28 **אִם**), Jos. 4, 21, see the Lexicon.

2. The conditional sentence is frequently found in an abridged form, where the suppressed clauses can be easily supplied from the context; comp. Gen. 13, 9. 24, 49. 1 Sam. 2, 16 **לֹא־דָמִי** and *if not*, equivalent to *and if thou wilt not give it to me, then I take it* (perfect according to § 106. n) *by force*; comp. 1 Sam. 6, 9. The use of **וְיִשׁ** alone in Jud. 6, 13 is peculiar, as also in 2 Ki. 10, 15 (where we should read with the LXX **וְיִשׁ וְיִהְיֶה וְיִשׁ** in the sense of *if it be so*; so in 2 Sam. 13, 26. 2 Ki. 5, 17 **וְלֹא** alone is used in the sense of *if really . . . not*, in each case with a following jussive equivalent to *may there at least, &c.* (cf. § 143. d).—In 1 Sam. 13, 13. Job 3, 13 the condition must be supplied from the preceding clause to complete the sentence introduced by **כִּי עָתִידָהּ** (Job 31, 28 by **כִּי**, 2 Ki. 13, 19 by **אִם**).—The apodosis also appears sometimes in an abridged form (e.g. Gen. 4, 24. Is. 43, 2) or is entirely suppressed, e.g. Gen. 30, 27. 38, 17. 50, 15 (see letter *y* above), Ex. 32, 32. Ps. 27, 13. Job 38, 5, where properly **כִּי תִרְעַע** must be supplied with **כִּי תִרְעַע** as in verses 4 and 18; cf. § 167. a.—In Ps. 8, 4, instead of the apodosis *I exclaim* which we should expect, the exclamation itself follows.

3. The absolute certainty with which a result is to be expected, is frequently emphasized by the insertion of **כִּי** Is. 7, 9; **אִם כִּי** 2 Sam. 2, 27. 19, 7. Job 11, 15; or **עַתָּה כִּי** *now verily*, Num. 22, 29. 1 Sam. 14, 30 after **לִי**, Gen. 31, 42. 43, 10 after **לְגַלְיָהּ**, Job 8, 6 after **דָּמָה**. On this *corroborative* **כִּי** comp. such passages as Gen. 18, 20, &c., and § 148. d.

4. Sometimes the force of a hypothetical particle extends beyond the apodosis to a second conditional clause, as in the case of **אִם** Prov. 9, 12. Job 10, 15. 16, 6. 22, 23, and **כִּי** Is. 43, 2.

5. In Ex. 33, 20 a negative statement takes the place of a condition with a negative consequence, *for a man doth not see me and live*, instead of *for if a man sees me, he does not live*; comp. the similar passages, Deut. 22, 1. 4 *thou shalt not see . . . and hide thyself*, instead of *if thou seest . . . thou shalt not hide thyself*.

§ 160. Concessive Clauses.

Besides the use of the imperative in the sense of a concession, *a* meant either seriously (§ 110. a) or mockingly (§ 110. f), and of

concessive circumstantial clauses (§ 141. *c*, § 142. *d*, and § 156. *f*), concessive clauses may be introduced—

- (a) By a simple **אם** *if*: thus Job 9, 15 with perfect, *if (=though) I had been in the right*; Is. 1, 18 and 10, 22 with imperfect in reference to a contingent event.
- b (b) By **אם כן** *yea though*, Is. 1, 15 with imperfect; for which we find simply **אם** in Is. 49, 15 with imperfect, *yea, though these may forget, yet . . .*; on the other hand, with perfect, Jer. 36, 25. Ps. 95, 9. Neh. 6, 1; finally **אם כי** *even if, though*, Eccles. 4, 14.
- c (c) By the preposition **ל** governing a complete noun-clause, as Job 16, 17 **לֹא חָתַם בְּכַפִּי** *notwithstanding that no violence is in mine hands*, or a verbal-clause, Is. 53, 9. On **ל** with the infinitive in a similar sense (equivalent to *in addition to the fact that = notwithstanding that*), comp. § 119. *aa*, note 2.

§ 161. Comparative Clauses.

- a 1. A comparison between two facts is sometimes established by simply uniting them with *wāw copulative*, especially in gnomic poetry, when facts of a moral nature are compared with those of the physical world, e. g. Job 5, 7 *man is born unto trouble, and the sons of flame fly upward*, i. e. as the sparks by nature fly upward, so man, &c.; Job 12, 11 (in an interrogative form; in 34, 3 the same comparison as a statement); more commonly in the opposite order, 14, 11 sq. Prov. 17, 3. 25, 3. 26, 3. 9. 14. 27, 21, &c.¹ Even without the connecting **ו** Job 24, 19 *drought and heat consume the snow waters*, **וְשָׂאֵל חַטָּאִים** so doth *Sheol* those who have sinned (comp. § 155. *n*); comp. Jer. 17, 11.
- b 2. The conjunction **כַּמֶּשֶׁל** (comp. § 155. *g*; the simple **כִּשְׁלֵי** occurs in the same sense in Ex. 10, 6. 14, 13. 34, 18) *as, quemadmodum*, is used as a comparative conjunction (Obad. 15), frequently with **כֵּן** *so*, corresponding to it in the apodosis, Is. 31, 4. 52, 14 sq. Sometimes, however, **כֵּן** (*so also*) occurs even after independent statements, Is. 55, 9. Jer. 3, 20.—Exact coincidence of two facts is expressed in Eccles. 5, 15 by **בְּכָל עֵצָה** *in all points as*.

¹ On this *wāw adaequationis*, and in general on these *figurative maxims* of comparison, see Delitzsch, *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch*, p. 9 sq. Moreover, instead of entire clauses, the nouns alone (without predicates) are frequently grouped together, e. g. Prov. 25, 12. 25 sq. (called by Delitzsch, the 'emblematic *Mashal*'). The expressions **עִם נֶחֱשֶׁב** prop. *to be counted with some one*, Ps. 88, 5, and **עִם נִשְׁוֶה** *to be likened with some one*, Ps. 28, 1. 143, 7, also arise from the idea of comparison implied in grouping things together. On this use of **עִם** cf. Job 9, 26, where *with* is equivalent to *like*.

Rem. On the use of כִּי *as*, with single nouns or pronouns to introduce comparisons, comp. § 118. *s*; on the alleged use of כִּי as a conjunction (equivalent to כִּי־כִּי), comp. § 155. *g*.—It is to be further remarked that כִּי־כִּי when used in correspondence with one another, *as—so* (e. g. Lev. 7, 7. Is. 24, 2. Hos. 4, 9; also *so—as*, Gen. 18, 25. 44, 18; in Jos. 14, 11. 1 Sam. 30, 24 כִּי־כִּי ; Ps. 127, 4 כִּי־כִּי , comp. Joel 2, 4), are not to be regarded as conjunctions, but as virtual substantives with a following genitive; $\text{כִּי־כִּי יְהוָה כִּי־כִּי הַזָּר}$ Num. 15, 15 properly means *the like of you shall be the like of the stranger*, i. e. *your duty shall be (also) the stranger's duty*; cf. Lev. 24, 22.

§ 162. *Disjunctive Sentences.*

The introduction of another possible case, excluding that which *a* preceded, is effected by אִם *or*, e. g. Ex. 21, 36, equivalent to the Latin *vel*; but also equivalent to *aut* with an exclusive antithesis, 2 Ki. 2, 16; so Is. 27, 5 אִם = *it would then happen that*, for which elsewhere כִּי אִם .

In the sense of *sive—sive* we find אִם—אִם , or דִּם—דִּם , or דִּם—דִּם *b* (see the examples in the Lexicon), also י—י Lev. 5, 3. Num. 9, 14. Deut. 24, 7. Is. 2, 13 sqq. Jer. 32, 20. Ps. 76, 7. Job 34, 29, perhaps also Ex. 21, 16 (but not Prov. 29, 9; comp. Delitzsch on the passage), and י—י (see § 143. *e*); cf. also דִּם—דִּם (in Gen. 24, 44 דִּם—דִּם) *both—and*; but אִם—אִם (in Gen. 21, 26 אִם—אִם ; Zech. 1, 18 אִם—אִם) *neither—nor*. On disjunctive questions, see § 150. *g*.

§ 163. *Adversative and Exeptive Clauses.*

1. After negative sentences (especially after prohibitions) the *a* antithesis (*but*) is introduced by דִּם יִּי , e. g. 1 Sam. 8, 19 *and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us*; Ps. 1, 2 and elsewhere; frequently also by יִּי alone, e. g. Gen. 18, 15. 19, 2, or even simply connected by י , Gen. 17, 5, וַיִּי as perfect consecutive; 42, 10; cf. Ex. 5, 18.

Rem. Sometimes the negation is only virtually contained in the preceding sentence, e. g. in the form of a rhetorical question (Mic. 6, 3 sq.) or of conditions which are to be regarded as not having been fulfilled (Job 31, 18); יִּי or דִּם יִּי in such cases becomes equivalent to *nay, rather*.

2. *Exeptive* clauses, depending on another sentence, are introduced *c* by יִּי דִּם *except that*, and (again after negative sentences, see letter *a* above) דִּם יִּי *unless*; especially דִּם יִּי with the perfect (equivalent

¹ Very probably this use of דִּם יִּי arises from the original meaning *for if, surely if* (יִּי in an affirmative sense); so evidently in Ex. 22, 22 as a forcible

to *unless previously*) after imperfects which contain a declaration, e. g. Gen. 32, 27 *I will not let thee go, except thou hast previously blessed me*; Lev. 22, 6. Is. 55, 10. 65, 6. Amos 3, 7. Ruth 3, 18. Finally, בְּלֹאִי אִם unless, Amos 3, 4 (with perfect after a rhetorical question), or simply בְּלֹאִי Gen. 43, 3 with a noun-clause, *except your brother be with you*; Is. 10, 4 after a rhetorical question, with a verbal-clause.

- d Rem. The principal statement, to which אִם פִּי appends an exception, must sometimes be supplied from the context; thus, Gen. 40, 14 (*I desire nothing else except that thou remember me*, equivalent to *only do thou remember*, &c. (comp. § 106. n, note 2). Comp. Mic. 6, 8, where אִם פִּי, equivalent to *nothing but*, is used before an infinitive, and Job 42, 8, equivalent to *only*, before a noun.

§ 164. Temporal Clauses.

- a 1. The relations of time existing between two different actions or events are frequently expressed without the aid of a conjunction simply by juxtaposition:—

(a) Actions or events are represented as wholly or in part *simultaneous* by connecting a noun-clause with another noun-clause or verbal-clause introduced by וְ (or הַיְהוּה), e. g. Gen. 7, 6 *and Noah was six hundred years old* (prop. *a son of six hundred years*), הַיְהוּה וְהַמִּבּוּל הָיָה and (i. e. *when*) *the flood was*. This is especially the case when the predicate of the noun-clause (frequently introduced by עוֹד *still*) is expressed by an active participle, e. g. Job 1, 16 sq. עוֹד הָיָה מְדַבֵּר וְהָיָה בָּא וְנָ' *he was yet speaking, and there came another*, &c.; see the numerous examples in § 111. g and § 116. u. Instead of a complete noun-clause there often occurs a simple *casus pendens* after כָּל־ with a participial attribute in the sense of *whenever any one* . . . , e. g. 1 Sam. 2, 13 כָּל־אִישׁ זֶבַח וְזָבַח וְנָ' *whenever any man offered sacrifice, then came*, &c.; 2 Sam. 2, 23 and elsewhere; see the examples (in which the second member is generally introduced by *wāw apodosis*) in § 116. w.

- b (b) Sequence is expressed by the juxtaposition (1) of two imperfects consecutive, e. g. Gen. 24, 19 וְהָיָה וְהָיָה *and when she had done giving him drink, she said*, &c.; 28, 8 sq. 29, 31. 30, 9. 32, 26, &c.; comp. § 111. d; (2) of a noun-clause with a passive participle as predicate, and a verbal-clause attached by וְ, e. g. Gen. 38, 25; comp. § 116. v; in Gen. 49, 29 an imperative follows without וְ; (3) of two perfects (frequently with the secondary idea of rapid succession¹ of the two actions or events in past time), e. g. Gen. 19, 23 . . . הָיָה וְהָיָה

resumption of the preceding אִם. Thus, e. g. Jud. 15, 7 is simply *surely when I have been avenged of you, after that I will cease*, equivalent to, *I will not cease, until I have*, &c. When the exception follows, an ellipse must be assumed, e. g. Ruth 3, 18 *surely* (or *for*) *when he has finished it* (then the man will rest). It is far less natural to assume such an ellipse with אִם פִּי *but* (before entire clauses as before single nouns); see letter a above.

¹ This secondary idea is implied here by the mere co-ordination of two independent verbal-clauses, just as the idea of simultaneous occurrence (according to § 116. u,

וְהָיָה כִּי יָרָא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ *the sun was just risen . . . , and Lot came, &c.*, comp. 1 Sam. 9, 5. 2 Sam. 2, 24; Gen. 44, 3 sq. Jud. 3, 24. 15, 14. 20, 39 sq.—In all these examples the subject follows immediately after the connective *Wāw*, and then the (simple) perfect. On the other hand, (4) a perfect consecutive follows another perfect consecutive to express the contingent succession of future actions, e.g. Gen. 44, 4 וְהָיָה כִּי יִפְגְּעוּם וְאָמְרוּ אֲלֵהֶם *and when thou dost overtake them (as soon as thou shalt have overtaken), thou shalt say unto them.* Naturally, examples of this kind are very closely related to conditional sentences; see, therefore, the examples in § 112. *kk* and § 159. *g*. On the connexion of an imperfect consecutive or a perfect with detached expressions of time (as equivalent to complete clauses), cf. § 111. *b*; on the imperfect consecutive after וְיָהִי and a statement of time, cf. § 111. *g*; on the perfect consecutive following a detached statement of time, as in Ex. 16, 6, cf. § 112. *oo*.—In 1 Sam. 29, 10 an imperative with י follows the perfect consecutive.

(5) The fact that one action or event has not yet taken place on the occurrence of another, is expressed by הָיָה (an adverb, not a conjunction) with the imperfect (according to § 107. *c*). The apodosis, which may consist of a subject and perfect or even of a noun-clause (Gen. 24, 15¹), is then connected by וְ (or וְהָיָה) as in the examples above, under no. 3, e.g. Gen. 19, 4 (comp. Jos. 2, 8) מָרָם וַיִּשְׁכְּבוּ וְאִשְׁי מִן הָעִיר . . . נִסְפוּ וְנָסְפוּ *they had not yet lain down, and (= when) the men of the city . . . compassed, &c.*; Gen. 24, 25.

2. Conjunctions used to introduce temporal clauses are כִּי and אֲשֶׁר *d* when (כִּי with the imperfect also = *as often as*, Ps. 8, 4); less frequently אֲמָ (joined with a perfect), e.g. Gen. 38, 9. Num. 21, 9. Jud. 6, 3. Ps. 41, 7. 94, 18, comp. also Is. 24, 13 = *quotiescunque*; also in the same sense with an imperfect, Num. 36, 4; with a perfect equivalent to the *futurum exactum*, Is. 4, 4. Other conjunctions of time are the compounds כִּימָּה *when*, Gen. 19, 15; אַחֲרָיִךְ *when, after that*; עַד־אֲשֶׁר *until* (also the simple עַד, e.g. Gen. 38, 11. Jos. 2, 22. 1 Sam. 1, 22 [with the imperfect = *only when*, as in 2 Sam. 10, 5]; 2, 5 and elsewhere; especially in the formula לֹא־יִשְׁאַר לְךָ *until there was none left remaining to him*, Num. 21, 35. Deut. 3, 3. Jos. 8, 22. 11, 8; but 1 Sam. 14, 19 *while, as long as*); עַד־אֲשֶׁר לֹא *before that*, Eccles. 12, 1. 2. 6 with an imperfect, as in Prov. 8, 26 עַד with a perfect; אֲמָ, עַד־אֲמָ *until the time when*; אַחֲרֵי־אֲשֶׁר (for which in Ezek.

note 1) is implied in the co-ordination of a noun-clause with another clause. In Gen. 27, 30 the immediate succession is especially emphasized by אָז and the infinitive absolute, *Jacob was yet scarce gone out . . . then Esau his brother came*; in Ps. 48, 6 by כִּי and the addition of two more perfects without י.

¹ On the perfect in the protasis, which is critically doubtful, comp. § 107. *c*.

² On אֲשֶׁר as an original demonstrative, cf. § 138. *a*; hence עַד־אֲשֶׁר נָשׁוּב *we shall return* is properly *up to that (moment)*—*we shall return*.

³ Analogous to the frequent use of *wenn* [prop. *if*] for *wann* [= *when*] in German.

- 40, 1 אַחֲרֵיכֶם; Lev. 25, 48. 1 Sam. 5, 9 simply אַחֲרֵי; Lev. 14, 43. Jer. 41, 16. Job 42, 7 simply אַחֲרֵי) *after that*; מֵאָז (prop. *since that time*; the dependent clause is attached to it in the same way as the attributive clause to the demonstrative אֵלֶּה § 138. e) *since*, Gen. 39, 5; בְּמֶרְסָם (and simply מֶרְסָם § 107. c) *before*; מִפְּנֵי (for מִפְּנֵי אֵלֶּה) *before*, Ps. 129, 6.
- e Rem. 1. With regard to the tenses used with the above conjunctions, the rules are practically the same as those given in § 158. d for causal clauses. The perfect indicates actions completed in the past or future (in the former case corresponding to the Latin pluperfect, § 106. f, and in the latter to the Latin *futurum exactum*, § 106. o), the imperfect denotes actions occurring contingently in the future. On מֶרְסָם, בְּמֶרְסָם, and עַד with the imperfect as a *tempus historicum*, comp. § 107. c.
- f 2. Clauses introduced by עַד, עַד־כִּי, or עַד־אֵלֶּה, sometimes express a limit which is not absolute (terminating the preceding action), but only relative, beyond which the action or condition described in the principal clause still continues; thus, עַד with the imperfect, Ps. 110, 1; עַד־כִּי with the perfect, Gen. 26, 13; עַד־אֵלֶּה with the perfect, Gen. 28, 15; with the imperfect, Ps. 112, 8.—Like the Arab. حَتَّى, עַד may even introduce a main clause; e.g. Ex. 15, 16 עַד־יָעָבֵר prop. no doubt=thus it came to this—they passed over, i. e. so they passed over.
- g 3. The infinitive construct governed by a preposition (§ 114. d, e) is very frequently used as the equivalent of a temporal clause; the infinitive with בְּ may usually be rendered in English by *when*, *as*, or *whilst*; the infinitive with כִּי by *when*, *as soon as* (in Prov. 10, 25 followed by a noun-clause introduced by *wāw apodosis*), or, when referring to the future, by *if*; the infinitive after מִן by *since*. According to § 111. g such statements of time are generally preceded by וְיָהִי and the apodosis follows in the imperfect consecutive; hence in 1 Sam. 17, 55 (cf. Driver on the passage) וְכִרְאוֹת with a simple perfect following, is unusual. On the continuation of these infinitival constructions by means of the perfect consecutive, comp. § 112. v, and in general, § 114. r.—With the participle בֹּאֵר appears to be used as the equivalent of a conjunction in בֹּאֵר מִלֵּשׁ as he drew back, Gen. 38, 29 (unless we should read בֹּאֵר מִלֵּשׁ, and in בֹּאֵר מִלֵּשׁ when it budded, 40, 10.

§ 165. Final Clauses¹.

- a 1. Like most of the dependent clauses hitherto treated, the final clause may also be joined by a simple *wāw copulative* to the main clause, unless the final clause is directly subordinated to the governing verb.

Examples of the connexion: (a) of a final imperfect (or jussive!) with a perfect by means of וְ, Lam. 1, 19, see § 107. q; with an interrogative sentence, 2 Sam.

¹ Comp. H. G. T. Mitchell, *Final Constructions of Biblical Hebrew*, Leipzig, 1879.

9, 1. 3. Job 38, 24; with an optative, Ps. 51, 9; (β) of a cohortative with an imperative by ׀, Gen. 29, 21. 1 Sam. 15, 16, or a jussive, Neh. 2, 5 (§ 108. d); (γ) of a jussive with an imperative by ׀, Ex. 9, 1. 2 Sam. 16, 11. 1 Ki. 5, 20. Ps. 59, 14. 86, 17; with a jussive, Job 21, 19, or cohortative, § 109. f, g (comp. also 2 Sam. 24, 21 the infinitive with ׀, Jon. 1, 11 קח with the 1st plur. imperf., and 2 Chron. 29, 10 עם-לכבי, which are equivalent to cohortatives); (δ) of an imperative with a jussive, cohortative, or interrogative sentence by ׀, § 110. i; (ε) of a perfect consecutive after another perfect consecutive, Lev. 14, 36; after an imperfect, § 112. m and p; similarly after a jussive, § 112. q; after an imperative, § 112. r.—On negative final clauses joined by ׀ to the imperfect (so Ex. 28, 43. 30, 20; and 2 Sam. 13, 25 after אל-נא with a jussive in the main clause) see the Rem. on § 109. g. In Ex. 28, 32. 39, 23 the negative final clause is simply connected by ׀.—On the use of an historical statement after verbs of commanding, where we should expect a final clause (e.g. Neh. 13, 9 *then I commanded, and they cleansed*, equivalent to *that they should cleanse, and they cleansed*; in Job 9, 7 a negative final clause is connected in this way by ׀), comp. § 120. f.

For examples of the direct subordination of the final imperfect (without ׀) see § 120. c.

2. Final conjunctions are לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר *to the end that*; also simply לְמַעַן Gen. 12, 13. 27, 25. Ex. 4, 5. Ps. 51, 6 and elsewhere; בְּעֵבֶר אֲשֶׁר prop. *for the purpose that*, Gen. 27, 10, and simply בְּעֵבֶר Gen. 27, 4. Ex. 9, 14. 20, 20; also the simple אֲשֶׁר¹ Deut. 4, 10. 40. 6, 3. 32, 46. Jos. 3, 7. Neh. 8, 14 sq.; negatively, לֹא אֲשֶׁר Gen. 11, 7. 24, 3. 1 Ki. 22, 16; or ׀ Eccles. 3, 14; also negatively, עַל-דִּבְרֵת שְׁלֵא *for the matter (purpose) that . . . not*, Eccles. 7, 14; לְבִלְתִּי with imperfect, Ex. 20, 20. 2 Sam. 14, 14 *that . . . not*.—Quite exceptional is the use of כִּן (if the text be right) in Deut. 33, 11 יְקִימוּן כִּן, with the imperfect, equivalent to *that . . . not* [in prose, סָקִים].

Rem. All the conjunctions here mentioned are naturally always used with the imperfect, see § 107. q (on Jos. 4, 24, see § 74. g).—On the negative conjunctions ׀ and כִּן *that not, lest*, see § 152. f and w. On the infinitive with ׀² (also לְמַעַן Gen. 18, 19. 37, 22 and elsewhere) as the equivalent of a final clause (Gen. 11, 5. 28, 4, &c.), see § 114. f, h, p. On the continuation of such infinitival constructions by means of the finite verb, see § 114. r. On the negation of the final infinitive by לְבִלְתִּי, § 114. s. On the preposition כִּן with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a negative final clause (Gen. 31, 29. 1 Sam. 15, 23, &c.), see § 119. x and y.

¹ In Ezek. 36, 27 a final clause is introduced by אֲשֶׁר אֵת, thus at the same time taking the form of an object-clause.

² On ׀ as a supposed conjunction (equivalent to the Arabic *fa*) 1 Ki. 6, 19, see § 66. i.

§ 166. Consecutive Clauses.

a 1. Consecutive clauses are added by means of simple *wāw* copulative with the jussive¹, especially after negative and interrogative sentences, e. g. Num. 23, 19 וַיִּתְּנָם וַיִּכְבֹּד וְכִן-אָדָם לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וַיִּכְבֹּד וְכִן-אָדָם לֹא אִישׁ אֵל *God is not a man, that he should lie, and (i.e. neither) the son of man, that he should repent*; Is. 53, 2 וְנִחְסְדֵהוּ; Hos. 14, 10 חָכֵם וְיָבִן אֵלֶּה נָבוֹן וְיִדְעֵם *who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?* In Gen. 16, 10 a negative consecutive clause comes after a cohortative, and in Ex. 10, 5 after a perfect consecutive.—On the other hand, in Job 9, 32. 33 the jussive in the sense of a consecutive clause is attached without *Wāw* to the preceding negative sentence (in verse 32 a second jussive follows, likewise without *Wāw*, *for he is not a man, as I am, that I should answer him, that we should come together in judgement*). On the imperfect consecutive as expressing a logical consequence, see § 111. *l*; on the perfect consecutive as a consecutive clause after a participle, see § 112. *n*.

b 2. Conjunctions introducing consecutive clauses are again (see § 157. *c*, note 2) וְ and וְאֵשֶׁר = *so that*; especially again after interrogative sentences, according to § 107. *u*; comp. Num. 16, 11 וְיִי, with the imperfect, *that ye murmur*; on the other hand, in Gen. 20, 10 with the perfect in reference to an action already completed. On וְאֵשֶׁר with the imperfect (or jussive) equivalent to *so that*, comp. further Gen. 13, 16. 22, 14; with perfect and imperfect, 1 Ki. 3, 12 sq., with the demonstrative force clearly discernible, depending on לָב; on וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא = *ut non*, comp. Deut. 28, 35. 1 Ki. 3, 8. 2 Ki. 9, 37.

On וְ with a substantive or infinitive as the equivalent of a consecutive clause, see § 119. *y*.

§ 167. Aposiopesis, Anacoluthon, Involved Series of Sentences.

a 1. *Aposiopesis* is the concealment or suppression of entire sentences or clauses, which are of themselves necessary to complete the sense², and therefore must be supplied from the context. This is especially

¹ That such examples as וַיִּכְבֹּד are to be regarded as jussive, is probable from the analogy of Hos. 14, 10 and Job 9, 33.

² On the other hand, those cases are not to be regarded as examples of *aposisopesis*, in which the answer, being closely connected with the question, is given simply in the infinitive with לְ; comp. § 147. *a*, note 1.

frequent after conditional clauses; besides the examples already given in § 159. *dd*, cf. also Ex. 32, 32 (the LXX and Samaritan supply ¹⁵⁷); Num. 5, 20. Jud. 9, 16 (in verse 19, after a long parenthesis, an imperative follows as the apodosis to this conditional clause); 1 Sam. 12, 14 sq. 2 Sam. 5, 8 (where indeed the text is probably very corrupt; comp. the addition in 1 Chron. 11, 6); 2 Sam. 23, 17. Ps. 27, 13. 1 Chron. 4, 10. For other examples of various kinds, see § 117. *l*, and especially § 147.—On Gen. 3, 22, comp. § 152. *w* at the end.

2. *Anacoluthon* is the change from a construction which has *b* been already begun to one of a different kind. It is found especially after long parentheses, because the speaker has either lost sight of the beginning of his sentence, or for the sake of clearness purposely makes a new beginning; thus Gen. 20, 13. 31, 52 and Ezek. 34, 10 (comp. § 149 at the end); Num. 14, 21 sqq. 32, 20 sqq. Deut. 17, 2 sqq. 24, 1 sqq. 29, 21 sqq. Jud. 10, 11 (where, after a series of intermediate sentences, the predicate *I saved you* is suppressed); perhaps also Is. 66, 18 (comp., however, Delitzsch on the passage, which is certainly corrupt)¹. On Gen. 23, 13 (¹⁵ with the imperative), see § 110. *e*.

3. We may mention as instructive examples of *involved series* of *c* sentences Gen. 24, 14 and 42 sqq., and Gen. 28, 6 sqq.

¹ On the other hand, from the Semitic point of view the various kinds of compound sentences are *not* to be regarded as instances of anacoluthon, e. g. Gen. 17, 14. 17, nor even Gen. 31, 40 (comp. § 143).

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

- P. 19, note 2, line 9, *after* 'ZDMG. 1895, 1 sqq.' *add* 'and 335 sqq.'
- § 5. *k*, compare Dalman, *Aramäische Grammatik*, p. 99, note 1, and especially König, *Lehrgebäude*, ii. 230 sqq.
- § 9. *e*, line 5, *omit* *l*.
- § 10. *g*, last line, *for* הַבְּרָכָה *read* הַבְּרָכָה ('הַבְּרָ' on p. 64, line 2, is a various reading).
- § 15. *a*, *add* 'J. M. Japhet, *Die Accente der heiligen Schrift*, Frankfurt, 1896.'
- § 28. *a*, line 11, *for* 'w'yehūdā' *read* 'w'y'hūdā.'
- § 45. *b*, line 4, *read* 'according to § 84*a*. *e*, goes back to the ground-form *gūtl*.'
- § 45. *g*, line 7, *after* '(Baer לְכַבֵּשׁ)' *add* 'in 2 Chron. 34, 10 Baer and Ginsburg *read* לְכַדֹּק.'
- § 49. *e*, line 8, *omit* 28, 15.
- § 49. *l*, line 5, *after* '2 Sam. 15, 33' *add* 'but Baer and Ginsburg *read* הָיָה.'
- § 51. *m*, *אֲנִי אֶמַּח* Amos 2, 10 (for *אֲנִי אֶמַּח*) should also have been mentioned.
- § 55. *c*, line 2; § 55. *d*, line 9; § 55. *f*, line 2; § 66. *e*, line 6; § 67. *e*, line 3, *for* י'ע' *read* י'ע'.
- § 58. *g*, line 5, *after* 'Deut.' *add* '6, 17 צָוָה.'
- § 62, line 8, *read* '64. *e*.'
- § 63. *e*, line 2 end, *read* 'letter *q*'; in line 6, *read* '§ 67. *n*.'
- P. 234, line 1, *after* 'Ps. 118, 14' *read* 'but this is probably for,' &c.
- § 90. *d*, line 2, *read* מִתְנַיִמָה.
- P. 285, line 1, *read* 'plur. מִתְנַיִמָה.'
- P. 289, *under* רִקְמָתִים *read* 'a double piece of richly woven stuff.'
- P. 296, *under* מִים 3rd plur. masc. *read* מִימֵיהֶם.
- P. 308, line 5, *for* הִנֵּנִי *read* הִנֵּנִי.

THE PARADIGMS.

IN the paradigms of the verbs, those forms which are to be especially noticed by the beginner are marked throughout by an asterisk as model forms. Thus e.g. in the strong verb the 3rd *sing. fem.* **קָטְלָהּ** is the model for **קָטְלָהּ**, which likewise has only a vocalic affirmative, and **קָטְלָהּ** is the model for **קָטְלָהּ**, **קָטְלָהּ** and **קָטְלָהּ**, which in the same way have a toneless affirmative beginning with a consonant. On the other hand, the forms **קָטְלָהּ** and **קָטְלָהּ**, where the affix beginning with a consonant has the tone, stand by themselves.—In the table of the pronouns the asterisk has a different meaning; see the foot-note there.—The bracketed forms (from Paradigm G onwards) are merely analogous formations not occurring in the Old Testament.

A. The Personal

Nominative of the Pronoun,
or *Pronomen separatum*.

Accusative of the Pronoun,

A.

Simple form.

Sing. I. comm. אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי;
אֲנִי, in pause אֲנִי I.

אֲנִי; אֲנִי; אֲנִי me.

2. { m. אַתָּה (אתָּ), in pause }
אַתָּה } thou.
f. אתָּ (אתִּי)

אַתָּה; אַתָּה, in pause אַתָּה, }
אַתָּה } thee.
אַתָּה; אַתָּה; אַתָּה, אַתָּה

3. { m. הוּא he.
f. הִיא she.

הוּא; הוּא (הוּ), הוּ; הוּ him.

הִיא; הִיא; הִיא her (eam).

Plur. I. comm. אֲנַחְנוּ (נַחְנוּ) we.

אֲנַחְנוּ; אֲנַחְנוּ us.

2. { m. אַתֶּם }
f. אתֶּנּוּ, אַתֶּנּוּ } you.

אַתֶּם; אַתֶּם }
(אַתֶּם; אַתֶּם) } you.

3. { m. הֵם, הֵם }
f. הֵנּוּ } they.

(הֵם), הֵם; הֵם, הֵם, הֵם *; הֵם,
(הֵם), הֵם * them (eos).
(הֵם), הֵם; הֵם, הֵם; (הֵם) them (eas).

Pronoun¹.

or *Suffixum Verbi*.

Genitive of the Pronoun, or *Suffixum Nominis*
(*Pron. possessivum*).

B.	A.	B.
With <i>nūn energicum</i> .	Attached to a sing. noun.	Attached to a noun plur. or dual.
אֲנִי; אַתָּה	אֲנִי <i>my</i> (prop. gen. <i>mei</i>).	אֲנִי <i>my</i> .
אָנֹכִי, (אָנֹכִי) not found.	אָנֹכִי, אָנֹכִי, in } <i>thy</i> pause אָנֹכִי } (prop. אָנֹכִי, אָנֹכִי, (אָנֹכִי) } <i>tui</i> .	אָנֹכִי } אָנֹכִי } <i>thy</i> .
הוּא; הֵיאָה; (הוּא)	הוּא, הוּא; הֵיאָה, הֵיאָה (הֵיאָה) <i>his</i> (<i>eius</i> and <i>suus</i>).	הוּא, הֵיאָה, הֵיאָה * <i>his</i> .
הִיאָה	הִיאָה; הִיאָה; הִיאָה <i>her</i> .	הִיאָה <i>her</i> .
אֲנֵינוּ? (see § 58. k)	אֲנֵינוּ; אֲנֵינוּ; (אֲנֵינוּ) <i>our</i> .	אֲנֵינוּ <i>our</i> .
these forms are not found.	אֲנִי; אֲנִי; } <i>your</i> . אֲנִי; אֲנִי; }	אֲנִי; אֲנִי; } <i>your</i> . אֲנִי; אֲנִי; }
	הֵמָּה; הֵמָּה, } הֵמָּה * } <i>their</i> . הֵמָּה, הֵמָּה, הֵמָּה }	הֵמָּה, הֵמָּה * } <i>their</i> . הֵמָּה }

¹ Forms with an asterisk are exclusively poetic, those in parentheses are rare.

		Qal.		Niph'al.	Pi'el.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	קָטַל*	קָבַד*	קָטַן*	קָטַל, קָטַל*
	3. f.	קָטְלָה*	קָבְדָה*	קָטְנָה*	קָטְלָה*
	2. m.	קָטַלְתָּ*	קָבַדְתָּ*	קָטַנְתָּ*	קָטַלְתָּ*
	2. f.	קָטַלְתְּ*	קָבַדְתְּ*	קָטַנְתְּ*	קָטַלְתְּ*
	1. c.	קָטַלְתִּי	קָבַדְתִּי	קָטַנְתִּי	קָטַלְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָטְלוּ	קָבְדוּ	קָטְנוּ	קָטְלוּ
	2. m.	קָטַלְתֶּם*	קָבַדְתֶּם*	קָטַנְתֶּם*	קָטַלְתֶּם*
	2. f.	קָטַלְתֶּן	קָבַדְתֶּן	קָטַנְתֶּן	קָטַלְתֶּן
	1. c.	קָטַלְנוּ	קָבַדְנוּ	קָטַנְנוּ	קָטַלְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>		קָבַד, קָטַל*		הִקְטַל*	קָטַל*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		קָטוּל*		הִקְטַל, נִקְטַל*	קָטַל, קָטַל*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	2. m.	קָטַל*	קָבַד*	הִקְטַל*	קָטַל*
	2. f.	קָטְלִי*	קָבְדִי	הִקְטְלִי*	קָטְלִי*
<i>Plur.</i>	2. m.	קָטְלוּ	קָבְדוּ	הִקְטְלוּ	קָטְלוּ
	2. f.	קָטְלֶנָה*	קָבְדֶנָה*	הִקְטְלֶנָה*	קָטְלֶנָה*
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטַל*	יִקְבֹּד*	יִקְטַן*	יִקְטַל*
	3. f.	תִּקְטַל	תִּקְבֹּד	תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל
	2. m.	תִּקְטַל	תִּקְבֹּד	תִּקְטַל	תִּקְטַל
	2. f.	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּקְבְּדִי	תִּקְטְלִי*	תִּקְטְלִי*
	1. c.	אִקְטַל	אִקְבֹּד	אִקְטַל	אִקְטַל
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְבְּדוּ	יִקְטְלוּ	יִקְטְלוּ
	3. f.	תִּקְטְלֶנָה*	תִּקְבְּדֶנָה*	תִּקְטְלֶנָה*	תִּקְטְלֶנָה*
	2. m.	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְבְּדוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ	תִּקְטְלוּ
	2. f.	תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּקְבְּדֶנָה	תִּקְטְלֶנָה	תִּקְטְלֶנָה
	1. c.	נִקְטַל	נִקְבֹּד	נִקְטַל	נִקְטַל

Shortened Impf. (*Jussive*).

<i>Part. act.</i>	קָטַל*	קָבַד	קָטַן	נִקְטַל*	קָטַל*
<i>pass.</i>	קָטָל*				

C. Strong Verb

		Suffixes		1 Sing.	2 Sing. m.	2 Sing. f.	3 Sing. m.
Perf. Qal	3. m.	{ קָטַלְנִי שָׁכַחְנִי }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְךָ	{ קָטַלְתָּהוּ קָטַלְתָּ }		
	3. f.	קָטַלְתִּי	קָטַלְתְּךָ	קָטַלְתְּךָ	{ קָטַלְתָּהוּ קָטַלְתָּ }		
	2. m.	קָטַלְתָּנִי	—	—	{ קָטַלְתָּהוּ קָטַלְתָּ }		
	2. f.	קָטַלְתִּי	—	—	קָטַלְתָּהוּ		
	1. c.	—	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	קָטַלְתִּיךָ	{ קָטַלְתִּי קָטַלְתִּיךָ }		
	Plur. 3. c.	קָטַלְנוּ	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם		
	2. m.	קָטַלְתֶּנִּי	—	—	קָטַלְתֶּם		
	1. c.	—	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם	קָטַלְתֶּם		
	Inf. Qal		{ קָטַלְי קָטַלְנִי }	{ קָטַלְךָ קָטַלְתֶּךָ }	קָטַלְךָ	קָטַלְתָּ	
Imp. Qal 2.		קָטַלְנִי	—	—	קָטַלְתָּ		
(from an Imperf. in a שָׁכַחְנִי)							
Imperf. Qal	3. m.	{ יִקְטַלְנִי יִשְׁכַּחְנִי }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִשְׁכַּחְךָ }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִשְׁכַּחְךָ }	{ יִקְטַלְתָּהוּ יִשְׁכַּחְתָּ }		
	3. m. with <i>Nún energ.</i>	{ יִקְטַלְנִי יִשְׁכַּחְנִי }	{ יִקְטַלְךָ יִשְׁכַּחְךָ }	—	יִקְטַלְתָּ		
	Plur. 3. m.	יִקְטַלְנוּ	יִקְטַלְתֶּם	יִקְטַלְתֶּם	יִקְטַלְתֶּם		
Perf. Pi'el	3. m.	קָטַלְנִי	קָטַלְתָּךָ	קָטַלְתָּךָ	קָטַלְתָּ		

with Suffixes.

3 Sing. f.	1 Plur.	2 Plur. m.	2 Plur. f.	3 Plur. m.	3 Plur. f.
קטלָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	{ קטלֵם קטלֵנָם }	קטלֵן
קטלֶתָהּ	קטלֵנָהּ	—	—	קטלֶתָם	wanting.
קטלֶתְהָ	קטלֵנָהּ	—	—	קטלֶתָם	wanting.
קטלֶתֶיךָ	קטלֵתֶיךָ	—	—	קטלֶתֶימֶ	wanting.
קטלֶתֶיךָ	—	קטלֶתֶיכֶם	wanting.	קטלֶתֶימֶ	קטלֶתֶיךָ
קטלֶוּהָ	קטלֵוּהָ	wanting.	wanting.	קטלֶוּם	קטלֶוּן
wanting.	קטלֵוּנָהּ	—	—	wanting.	wanting.
קטלֶוּהָ	—	קטלֵוּכֶם	wanting.	קטלֵוּם	wanting.
קטלָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	{ קטלֵכֶם קטלֵנָם }	wanting.	קטלֵם	קטלֵן
{ קטלֵהָ קטלֵהָ }	קטלֵנוּ	—	—	קטלֵם	—
{ קטלֵהָ קטלֵהָ }	{ קטלֵנוּ קטלֵנוּ }	קטלֵכֶם	wanting.	קטלֵם	wanting.
קטלֵנָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	—	—	—	—
קטלֵנָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	קטלֵכֶם	wanting.	קטלֵם	wanting.
קטלֵנָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	—	—	—	—
קטלֵנָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	קטלֵכֶם	wanting.	קטלֵם	wanting.
קטלָהּ	קטלֵנוּ	wanting.	wanting.	קטלֵם	קטלֵן

D. Verbs primae gutturalis.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	עָמַד	נִעְמַד *	הֶעֱמִיד *	הֻעְמַד *
3. f.	עָמְדָה	נִעְמְדָה *	הֶעֱמִידָה	הֻעְמְדָה *
2. m.	עָמַדְתָּ	נִעְמַדְתָּ	הֶעֱמַדְתָּ	הֻעְמַדְתָּ
2. f.	עָמַדְתְּ	נִעְמַדְתְּ	הֶעֱמַדְתְּ	הֻעְמַדְתְּ
1. c.	עָמַדְתִּי	נִעְמַדְתִּי	הֶעֱמַדְתִּי	הֻעְמַדְתִּי
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>	עָמְדוּ	נִעְמְדוּ	הֶעֱמִידוּ	הֻעְמְדוּ
2. m.	עָמַדְתֶּם *	נִעְמַדְתֶּם	הֶעֱמַדְתֶּם	הֻעְמַדְתֶּם
2. f.	עָמַדְתֶּן *	נִעְמַדְתֶּן	הֶעֱמַדְתֶּן	הֻעְמַדְתֶּן
1. c.	עָמַדְנוּ	נִעְמַדְנוּ	הֶעֱמַדְנוּ	הֻעְמַדְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	עֹמֵד *	הֶעֱמֵד *	הֶעֱמִיד *	
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	עֹמֵד	נִעְמֹד, הָאֵמֵד	הֶעֱמֵד *	הֻעְמֵד *
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	עֹמֵד *	חֹק *	הֶעֱמֵד *	הֶעֱמֵד
f.	עֹמְדִי	חֹמִי	הֶעֱמִדִי	הֶעֱמִדִי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	עֹמְדוּ	חֹקוּ	הֶעֱמְדוּ	הֶעֱמִידוּ
f.	עֹמְדָנָה *	חֹקְנָה *	הֶעֱמְדָנָה	הֶעֱמִידָנָה
<i>Impf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	יֵעֲמֵד *	יִחְזֹק *	יֵעֲמֵד *	יֵעֲמֵד *
3. f.	תֵּעֲמֹד	תִּחְזֹק	תֵּעֲמֵד	תֵּעֲמֵד
2. m.	תֵּעֲמֹד	תִּחְזֹק	תֵּעֲמֵד	תֵּעֲמֵד
2. f.	תֵּעֲמְדִי *	תִּחְזְקִי *	תֵּעֲמִדִי	תֵּעֲמִדִי *
1. c.	אֵעֲמֹד *	אִחְזֹק	אֵעֲמֵד	אֵעֲמֵד
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	יֵעֲמְדוּ *	יִחְזְקוּ *	יֵעֲמְדוּ	יֵעֲמִדוּ
3. f.	תֵּעֲמְדָנָה	תִּחְזְקָנָה	תֵּעֲמְדָנָה	תֵּעֲמִדָנָה
2. m.	תֵּעֲמְדוּ	תִּחְזְקוּ	תֵּעֲמְדוּ	תֵּעֲמִדוּ
2. f.	תֵּעֲמְדָנָה	תִּחְזְקָנָה	תֵּעֲמְדָנָה	תֵּעֲמִדָנָה
1. c.	נֵעֲמֹד	נִחְזֹק	נֵעֲמֵד	נֵעֲמֵד
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יֵעֲמֵד	
<i>Part. act.</i>	עֹמֵד	נִעְמֵד *	מֵעֲמִיד *	
<i>pass.</i>	עֹמֵד			מֻעְמֵד

E. Verbs mediae gutturalis.

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>	<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	שָׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	פָּרַח*	פָּרַח*	הִתְפָּרַח*
3. <i>f.</i>	שָׁחַטָה*	נִשְׁחַטָה*	פָּרְחָה	[פָּרְחָה]	הִתְפָּרְחָה
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	פָּרַחְתָּ	פָּרַחְתָּ	הִתְפָּרַחְתָּ
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁחַטְתָּ	נִשְׁחַטְתָּ	פָּרַחְתָּ	פָּרַחְתָּ	הִתְפָּרַחְתָּ
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁחַטְתִּי	נִשְׁחַטְתִּי	פָּרַחְתִּי	פָּרַחְתִּי	הִתְפָּרַחְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	שָׁחַטוּ*	נִשְׁחַטוּ*	פָּרְחוּ	פָּרְחוּ	הִתְפָּרְחוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁחַטְתֶּם	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּם	פָּרַחְתֶּם	פָּרַחְתֶּם	הִתְפָּרַחְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁחַטְתֶּן	נִשְׁחַטְתֶּן	פָּרַחְתֶּן	פָּרַחְתֶּן	הִתְפָּרַחְתֶּן
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁחַטְנוּ	נִשְׁחַטְנוּ	פָּרַחְנוּ	פָּרַחְנוּ	הִתְפָּרַחְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁחַט	הִשְׁחַט	פָּרַח*		הִתְפָּרַח*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שָׁחַטָה	נִשְׁחַטָה	פָּרַח*	wanting.	
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	שָׁחַט*	הִשְׁחַט	פָּרַח*		הִתְפָּרַח*
<i>f.</i>	שָׁחַטִי*	הִשְׁחַטִי*	פָּרַחִי*		[הִתְפָּרַחִי]
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	שָׁחַטוּ	הִשְׁחַטוּ	פָּרְחוּ	wanting.	הִתְפָּרְחוּ
<i>f.</i>	שָׁחַטְנָה	הִשְׁחַטְנָה	פָּרַחְנָה*		הִתְפָּרַחְנָה
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁחַט*	יִשְׁחַט	יִפְרַח*	יִפְרַח*	יִתְפָּרַח*
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּפְרַח	תִּפְרַח	תִּתְפָּרַח
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּשְׁחַט	תִּפְרַח	תִּפְרַח	תִּתְפָּרַח
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תִּשְׁחַטִי*	תִּפְרַחִי	[תִּפְרַחִי]	[תִּתְפָּרַחִי]
1. <i>c.</i>	אִשְׁחַט	אִשְׁחַט	אִפְרַח	אִפְרַח	אִתְפָּרַח
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יִשְׁחַטוּ	יִפְרַחוּ	יִפְרַחוּ	יִתְפָּרְחוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּפְרַחְנָה	תִּפְרַחְנָה	תִּתְפָּרַחְנָה
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תִּשְׁחַטוּ	תִּפְרַחוּ	תִּפְרַחוּ	תִּתְפָּרַחוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּשְׁחַטְנָה	תִּפְרַחְנָה	תִּפְרַחְנָה	תִּתְפָּרַחְנָה
1. <i>c.</i>	נִשְׁחַט	נִשְׁחַט	נִפְרַח	נִפְרַח	נִתְפָּרַח
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁחַטְוִי				
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁחֵט	נֹשֵׁחַט	מִפְרֵיחַ*		מִתְפָּרֵיחַ*
<i>pass.</i>	שָׁחֻט			מִפְרֵיחַ*	

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	שִׁלַּח*
3. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלְחָה	נִשְׁלַחַת	שִׁלְחָה
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַחְתָּ	נִשְׁלַחְתָּ	שִׁלַּחְתָּ
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלַחְתְּ*	נִשְׁלַחְתְּ*	שִׁלַּחְתְּ*
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלַחְתִּי	נִשְׁלַחְתִּי	שִׁלַּחְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלְחוּ	נִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁלְחוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַחְתֶּם	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּם	שִׁלַּחְתֶּם
2. <i>f.</i>	שָׁלַחְתֶּן	נִשְׁלַחְתֶּן	שִׁלַּחְתֶּן
1. <i>c.</i>	שָׁלַחְנוּ	נִשְׁלַחְנוּ	שִׁלַּחְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	שָׁלַח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁשְׁלַח*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	שֹׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	שִׁלַּח
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> <i>m.</i>	שָׁלַח*	הִשְׁלַח*	שִׁשְׁלַח*
<i>f.</i>	שִׁלְחִי	הִשְׁלְחִי	שִׁשְׁלְחִי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	שִׁלְחוּ	הִשְׁלְחוּ	שִׁשְׁלְחוּ
<i>f.</i>	שִׁלְחֵנָה*	הִשְׁלְחֵנָה	שִׁשְׁלְחֵנָה*
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁלַח*	יִשְׁלַח*	יִשְׁלַח*
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלַח
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַחִי	תִּשְׁלַחִי	תִּשְׁלַחִי
1. <i>c.</i>	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלַח
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִשְׁלְחוּ	יִשְׁלְחוּ	יִשְׁלְחוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה*
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּשְׁלְחוּ	תִּשְׁלְחוּ	תִּשְׁלְחוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה	תִּשְׁלַחְנָה
1. <i>c.</i>	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלַח
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִשְׁלַחֲנִי		
<i>Part. act.</i>	שֹׁלַח*	נִשְׁלַח	מִשְׁלַח*
<i>pass.</i>	שֹׁלַח*		

tertiaie gutturalis.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
שָׁלַח	*הִשְׁלִיחַ	הִשְׁלַח	*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
שִׁלְחָהּ	הִשְׁלִיחָהּ	הִשְׁלַחָהּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָהּ
שִׁלְחָתָם	הִשְׁלִיחָתָם	הִשְׁלַחָתָם	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתָם
*שִׁלְחָתָהּ	*הִשְׁלִיחָתָהּ	*הִשְׁלַחָתָהּ	*הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתָהּ
שִׁלְחָתִי	הִשְׁלִיחָתִי	הִשְׁלַחָתִי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחָתִי
שִׁלְחוּ	הִשְׁלִיחוּ	הִשְׁלַחוּ	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
שִׁלְחוּם	הִשְׁלִיחוּם	הִשְׁלַחוּם	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּם
שִׁלְחוּן	הִשְׁלִיחוּן	הִשְׁלַחוּן	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּן
שִׁלְחוּנִי	הִשְׁלִיחוּנִי	הִשְׁלַחוּנִי	הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּנִי
	*הִשְׁלִיחַ		*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
	*הִשְׁלַח	*הִשְׁלַח	
	הִשְׁלַח		*הִשְׁתַּלַּח
wanting.	הִשְׁלִיחִי	wanting.	הִשְׁתַּלַּחִי
	הִשְׁלִיחוּ		הִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
	הִשְׁלַחְנָהּ		*הִשְׁתַּלַּחְנָהּ
יִשְׁלַח	*יִשְׁלִיחַ	יִשְׁלַח	יִשְׁתַּלַּח
תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלִיחַ	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁלִיחַ	תִּשְׁלַח	תִּשְׁתַּלַּח
יִשְׁלַחִי	יִשְׁלִיחִי	יִשְׁלַחִי	יִשְׁתַּלַּחִי
אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁלִיחַ	אִשְׁלַח	אִשְׁתַּלַּח
יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁלִיחוּ	יִשְׁלַחוּ	יִשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ	תִּשְׁלִיחְנָהּ	תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ	*תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָהּ
תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁלִיחוּ	תִּשְׁלַחוּ	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחוּ
תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ	תִּשְׁלִיחְנָהּ	תִּשְׁלַחְנָהּ	תִּשְׁתַּלַּחְנָהּ
נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁלִיחַ	נִשְׁלַח	נִשְׁתַּלַּח
	יִשְׁלַח		
	*מִשְׁלִיחַ		*מִשְׁתַּלַּח
מִשְׁלַח		מִשְׁלַח	

G. Verbs mediae geminatae

		Qal.	Niph'al.
Perf. Sing.	3. m.	קָבַב, תָּם*	נָקַב, נָטַם*
	3. f.	קָבְבָה, תָּמָה	נָקְבָה
	2. m.	קָבַוְתָ*	נָקְבַוְתָ*
	2. f.	קְבוֹת	נְקְבוֹת
	1. c.	קְבוֹתִי	נְקְבוֹתִי
Plur.	3. c.	קָבְבוּ, תָּמָה	נָקְבוּ
	2. m.	קָבַוְתֶם	נָקְבַוְתֶם
	2. f.	קְבוֹתֵינָן	נְקְבוֹתֵינָן
	1. c.	קְבוֹנוּ	נְקְבוֹנוּ
Inf.		קַבֵּ*	הִקַּב
Inf. absol.		קָבוֹב	הִקֵּם, הִסִּיב
Imp. Sing.	m.	קַבֵּ*	הִקַּב
	f.	קַבִּי*	הִקְבִּי
Plur.	m.	קַבֵּ	הִקְבִּי
	f.	[קַבִּינָה]	[הִקְבִּינָה]
Impf. Sing.	3. m.	יָקַב* (יָקַל § 67, Rem. 3)	יָסַב*
	3. f.	תָּקַב	תָּסַב
	2. m.	תָּקַב	תָּסַב
	2. f.	תָּקְבִי*	תָּסְבִי*
	1. c.	אָקַב	אָסַב
Plur.	3. m.	יָסְבוּ	יָסְבוּ
	3. f.	תָּקְבִינָה*	[תָּסְבִינָה]
	2. m.	תָּקַבּוּ	תָּסְבוּ
	2. f.	[תָּקְבִינָה]	[תָּסְבִינָה]
	1. c.	נָקַב	נָסַב
Impf. with Wāw consec.		וַיָּקַב* (pause וַיִּסַּב)	
Impf. with Suff.		יָסְבִּי*	
Part. act.		קָבֵב	נָקֵב
pass.		קָבֻב*	(fem. נְקֻבָּה)

or double v.

<i>Hiph'fl.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Po'el.</i>	<i>Po'al.</i>
*הִסָּב, הִסָּב	*הִסָּב	*סִוָּב	*סִוָּב
*הִסָּבָה	הִסָּבָה	סִוָּבָה	[סִוָּבָה]
*הִסָּבֹתָ	[הִסָּבֹתָ]	סִוָּבֹתָ	סִוָּבֹתָ
הִסָּבֹת	הִסָּבֹת	סִוָּבֹתָ	סִוָּבֹתָ
הִסָּבֹתִי	[הִסָּבֹתִי]	סִוָּבֹתִי	סִוָּבֹתִי
הִסָּב, חִלְלוּ	הִסָּב	סִוָּב	סִוָּב
הִסָּבֹתָם	[הִסָּבֹתָם]	סִוָּבֹתָם	סִוָּבֹתָם
הִסָּבֹתָן	הִסָּבֹתָן	סִוָּבֹתָן	סִוָּבֹתָן
הִסָּבֹתִי	[הִסָּבֹתִי]	סִוָּבֹתִי	[סִוָּבֹתִי]
*הִסָּב		סִוָּב	
הִסָּב		סִוָּב	[סִוָּב]
*הִסָּב		סִוָּב	
הִסָּבִי		[סִוָּבִי]	
הִסָּב	wanting.	סִוָּב	wanting.
[הִסָּבִיָּה]		סִוָּבִיָּה	
*יָסָּב, יָסָּב	*יָסָּב, יָסָּב	יָסָּב	[יָסָּב]
יָסָּב	[יָסָּב]	יָסָּב	יָסָּב
יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב
[יָסָּבִי]	*יָסָּבִי	[יָסָּבִי]	יָסָּבִי
יָסָּב	[יָסָּב]	[יָסָּב]	יָסָּב
יָסָּב, יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב
*יָסָּבִיָּה	*יָסָּבִיָּה	[יָסָּבִיָּה]	יָסָּבִיָּה
יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב	יָסָּב
יָסָּבִיָּה	יָסָּבִיָּה	[יָסָּבִיָּה]	יָסָּבִיָּה
יָסָּב	[יָסָּב]	[יָסָּב]	[יָסָּב]
יָסָּב			
*יָסָּבִי (יָסָּבִיָּה)		יָסָּבִי	
*יָסָּב		יָסָּב	
	יָסָּב		יָסָּב

H. Verbs פ'ע.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	נָפַל [נָפַשׁ]	נָפַשׁ*	הִנָּשׁ*	הִנָּשׁ*
3. f.		נָפְשָׁה	הִנָּשָׁה	הִנָּשָׁה
2. m.		נָפַשְׁתָּ	הִנָּשַׁתָּ	הִנָּשַׁתָּ
2. f.		נָפַשְׁתְּ	הִנָּשַׁתְּ	הִנָּשַׁתְּ
1. c.		נָפַשְׁתִּי	הִנָּשַׁתִּי	הִנָּשַׁתִּי
<i>Plur. 3. c.</i>	regular.	נָפְשׁוּ	הִנָּשׁוּ	הִנָּשׁוּ
2. m.		נָפַשְׁתֶּם	הִנָּשַׁתֶּם	הִנָּשַׁתֶּם
2. f.		נָפַשְׁתֶּן	הִנָּשַׁתֶּן	הִנָּשַׁתֶּן
1. c.		נָפַשְׁנוּ	הִנָּשַׁנוּ	הִנָּשַׁנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	נָפְשׁוּ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּשׁ	הִנָּשׁ*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	נָפַשׁ	נִפְּשׁוּ, הִנָּפַשׁ	הִנָּשׁ*	הִנָּשׁ*
<i>Imp. Sing. m.</i>	נָפֵשׁ*	נָפַל*	הִנָּשׁ	הִנָּשׁ*
f.	נָפְשִׁי	נָפְלִי	הִנָּפְשִׁי	הִנָּפְשִׁי
<i>Plur. m.</i>	נָפְשׁוּ	נָפְלוּ	הִנָּפְשׁוּ	הִנָּפְשׁוּ
f.	נָפְשֶׁנָּה	נָפְלֶנָּה	הִנָּפְשֶׁנָּה	הִנָּפְשֶׁנָּה
<i>Impf. Sing. 3. m.</i>	יִנָּשׁ*	יִפֹּל*	[יִנָּפֵשׁ]	יִנָּשׁ*
3. f.	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּפֹּל	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּנָּשׁ
2. m.	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּפֹּל	תִּנָּשׁ	תִּנָּשׁ
2. f.	תִּנָּשִׁי	תִּפֹּלִי	תִּנָּשִׁי	תִּנָּשִׁי
1. c.	אִנָּשׁ	אִפֹּל	אִנָּשׁ	אִנָּשׁ
<i>Plur. 3. m.</i>	יִנָּשׁוּ	יִפֹּלוּ	יִנָּשׁוּ	יִנָּשׁוּ
3. f.	תִּנָּשְׁנָה	תִּפֹּלְנָה	תִּנָּשְׁנָה	תִּנָּשְׁנָה
2. m.	תִּנָּשׁוּ	תִּפֹּלוּ	תִּנָּשׁוּ	תִּנָּשׁוּ
2. f.	[תִּנָּשְׁנָה]	[תִּפֹּלְנָה]	[תִּנָּשְׁנָה]	[תִּנָּשְׁנָה]
1. c.	נִנָּשׁ	נִפֹּל	נִנָּשׁ	נִנָּשׁ
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>			יִנָּשׁ*	
<i>Part. act.</i>	נִנָּשׁ		נִנָּשׁ*	מִנָּשׁ*
<i>pass.</i>	נִנָּשׁ			מִנָּשׁ

I. Weak Verbs, א"ד.

	Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.
Perf.	אָכַל	נִאָכַל *	הֵאָכִיל *	הִאָכַל *

Like Verbs *primae gutturalis*.

Inf.		אָכַל, אֵכֵל *	הֵאָכִיל	הֵאָכִיל	הִאָכַל
Inf. absol.		אָכַל	הֵאָכִיל	wanting.	wanting.
Impf. Sing.	m.	אָכַל *	הֵאָכִיל	הֵאָכִיל	
	f.	אֵכֵל	&c.	&c.	wanting.
Plur.	m.	אָכְלוּ			
	f.	[אֵכְלֶנָה]			
Impf. Sing.	3. m.	יֵאָכֵל * (in pause	יֵאָכֵל *	יֵאָכִיל *	יֵאָכַל *
	3. f.	תֵּאָכֵל (יֵאָכֵל)	&c.	&c.	&c.
	2. m.	תֵּאָכֵל			
	2. f.	תֵּאָכְלִי			
	1. c.	אֵכֵל *			
Plur.	3. m.	יֵאָכְלוּ			
	3. f.	תֵּאָכְלֶנָה			
	2. m.	תֵּאָכְלוּ			
	2. f.	[תֵּאָכְלֶנָה]			
	1. c.	נֵאָכַל			
Impf. with Waw consec.		וַיֵּאָכֵר *			
		וַיֵּאָכַל *			
Part. act.		אֹכֵל	נֹאכֵל	מֵאָכִיל	
pass.		אֹכֵל			מֵאָכֵל

K. Weak Verbs,

	Qal.	Niph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	לָשַׁב	*נָשַׁב
3. f.		*נָשְׁבָה
2. m.		נָשַׁבְתָּ
2. f.		נָשַׁבְתְּ
1. c.		נָשַׁבְתִּי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. c.	regular.	נָשַׁבוּ
2. m.		נָשַׁבְתֶּם
2. f.		נָשַׁבְתֶּן
1. c.		נָשַׁבְנוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	יֹסֵד, לָשַׁבְתָּ	*הִלָּשַׁב
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	לָשַׁב	wanting.
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> m.	*לָשַׁב, דַּע	*הִלָּשַׁב
f.	לָשַׁבְי	הִלָּשַׁבִּי
<i>Plur.</i> m.	לָשַׁבוּ	הִלָּשַׁבוּ
f.	לָשַׁבְנָה	[הִלָּשַׁבְנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. m.	*לָשַׁב	*יִלָּשַׁב
3. f.	תִּלָּשַׁב	תִּלָּשַׁב
2. m.	תִּלָּשַׁב	תִּלָּשַׁב
2. f.	תִּלָּשַׁבִּי	תִּלָּשַׁבִּי
1. c.	אֶלָּשַׁב	*אֶלָּשַׁב
<i>Plur.</i> 3. m.	יִלָּשַׁבוּ	יִלָּשַׁבוּ
3. f.	תִּלָּשַׁבְנָה	[תִּלָּשַׁבְנָה]
2. m.	תִּלָּשַׁבוּ	תִּלָּשַׁבוּ
2. f.	[תִּלָּשַׁבְנָה]	[תִּלָּשַׁבְנָה]
1. c.	נִלָּשַׁב	נִלָּשַׁב
<i>Shortened Impf. (Jussive).</i>		
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>	*וְלָשַׁב	*וְלָשַׁב
<i>Part. act.</i>	לָשַׁב	*נָשַׁב
<i>pass.</i>	לָשַׁב	

ו'ם (for ו'ם).

L. Verbs properly ו'ם.

Hiph'il.	Hoph'al.	Qal.	Hiph'il.
הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיבָה הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת	הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיבָה הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת	יָטַב regular.	הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיבָה הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת הוֹשִׁיבָת
הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב	הוֹשִׁיב	יָטַב יָטַב	הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב
הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב [הוֹשִׁיבָת]	wanting.		הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב הוֹשִׁיב [הוֹשִׁיבָת]
יָשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב יָשַׁב יָשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] תָּשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] נָשַׁב	יָשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב יָשַׁב תָּשַׁבָּה תָּשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] נָשַׁב	יָשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב יָשַׁב יָשַׁב תָּשַׁבָּה תָּשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] נָשַׁב	יָשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב תָּשַׁב יָשַׁב יָשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] תָּשַׁב [תָּשַׁבָּה] נָשַׁב
יָשַׁב יָשַׁב		יָשַׁב יָשַׁב	יָשַׁב יָשַׁב
מָשַׁב	מָשַׁב	יָשַׁב יָשַׁב	מָשַׁב

		Qal.	Niph'al.	Hiph'al.
<i>Perf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	קָם*	מָת*	הָקִים*
	3. f.	קָמָה*	מָתָה*	הָקִימָה*
	2. m.	קָמַת*	מָתַח*	הָקִימֹת*
	2. f.	קָמַתְּ	[מָתְּ]	הָקִימֹת
	1. c.	קָמַתִּי	מָתִי	הָקִימֹתִי
	3. c.	קָמַתְּ	מָתְּ	הָקִימֹתְּ
	2. m.	קָמַתְּ	מָתְּ	הָקִימֹתְּ
<i>Plur.</i>	3. c.	קָמַתְּ	מָתְּ	הָקִימֹתְּ
	2. f.	[קָמַתְּ]	[מָתְּ]	[הָקִימֹתְּ]
	1. c.	קָמַתְּ	מָתְּ	הָקִימֹתְּ
<i>Inf.</i>		קִים*	הָקִים*	הָקִים*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>		קִים*	הָקִים, נָסֹג	הָקִים*
<i>Imp. Sing.</i>	m.	קִים*	הָקִים*	הָקִים*
	f.	קָמִי*	[הָקִמִּי]	הָקִמִּי*
	Plur. m.	קָמוּ	הָקִמוּ	הָקִמוּ
	f.	קָמְנָה*	[הָקִמְנָה]	[הָקִמְנָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i>	3. m.	יָקֹם, יָבֹא	יָקֹם*	יָקִים*
	3. f.	תָּקֹם	תָּקֹם	תָּקִים
	2. m.	תָּקֹם	תָּקֹם	תָּקִים
	2. f.	תָּקֹמִי*	[תָּקֹמִי]	תָּקִימִי*
	1. c.	אָקֹם	אָקֹם	אָקִים
	3. m.	יָקֹמוּ	יָקֹמוּ	יָקִימוּ
	3. f.	תָּקִימְנָה, תִּשְׁלַכְנָה*		תָּקִימְנָה, תָּקִימְנָה*
<i>Plur.</i>	3. m.	יָקֹמוּ	יָקֹמוּ	יָקִימוּ
	2. m.	תָּקִימוּ	תָּקִימוּ	תָּקִימוּ
	2. f.	תָּקִימְנָה		[תָּקִימְנָה]
	1. c.	נָקִים	נָקִים	נָקִים
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>		יָקִים*		יָקִים*
<i>Impf. with Wāw consec.</i>		וַיָּקִים (pause וַיָּקִים*)		וַיָּקִים*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>		יָקִימְנִי*		יָקִימְנִי*
<i>Part. act.</i>		קָם*	נָקֹם*	מָקִים*
	pass.	קָם*		

Verbs, ४५.

N. Weak Verbs, v'y.

<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Pi'lel.</i>	<i>Pu'lal.</i>	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>
הִקָּח*	קִיחַ*	קִיחַ*	בָּן*	נָבֹן*
[הִקָּחָה]	קִיחָה	[קִיחָה]	בָּנָה*	[נָבֹנָה]
הִקָּחָתָּ	קִיחָתָּ	קִיחָתָּ	בָּנִיתָ*	נִבְנֹתָ
הִקָּחָתְךָ	[קִיחָתְךָ]	[קִיחָתְךָ]	בָּנִיתָ	[נִבְנֹתָ]
[הִקָּחָתִי]	קִיחָתִי	קִיחָתִי	[בָּנִיתִי]	נִבְנֹתִי
הִקָּחָנוּ	קִיחָנוּ	קִיחָנוּ	בָּנוּ	
הִקָּחָתֶם	[קִיחָתֶם]	[קִיחָתֶם]	[בָּנֶתֶם]	See
הִקָּחְתָּן	קִיחְתָּן	קִיחְתָּן	בָּנְתָן]	Verbs Y'ע.
[הִקָּחְנוּ]	קִיחְמוּ	קִיחְמוּ	בָּנוּ	
הִקָּחָם*	קִיחָם		בָּן*	
			בֵּן*	
	קִיחָם		בֵּין*	
	[קִיחָמִי]	wanting.	בִּינִי	
	קִיחָמוּ		בִּינוּ	
	[קִיחָמְנָה]		—	
יִקָּח*	יִקָּח*	יִקָּח*	יָנִיל	
תִּקָּח	תִּקָּח	[תִּקָּח]	תָּנִיל	
[תִּקָּח]	תִּקָּח	תִּקָּח	תָּנִיל	
תִּקָּחִי	[תִּקָּחִי]	תִּקָּחִי	תָּנִילִי	
[תִּקָּח]	תִּקָּח	[תִּקָּח]	אָנִיל	
יִקָּחוּ	יִקָּחוּ	יִקָּחוּ	יָנִילוּ	
[תִּקָּחְנָה]	תִּקָּחְנָה	תִּקָּחְנָה	תָּנִילְנָה	
תִּקָּחוּ	תִּקָּחוּ	תִּקָּחוּ	תָּנִילוּ	
[תִּקָּחְנָה]	תִּקָּחְנָה	תִּקָּחְנָה	תָּנִילְנָה	
טָח	[טָח]	[טָח]	נָנִיל	
			יָנִיל	
			תָּנִיל	
			יִיבִנִי	
מִקָּח*	מִקָּח			נָבֹן
מִקָּח*	מִקָּח			

O. Weak

		Qal.	Niph'al.	Pi'el.	
Perf. Sing.	3. m.	קָצַח*	קָצַח	קָצַח	
	3. f.	קָצְחָה	קָצְחָה	[קָצְחָה]	
	2. m.	קָצַחְתָּ*	קָצַחְתָּ	קָצַחְתָּ*	
	2. f.	קָצַחְתְּ	קָצַחְתְּ	[קָצַחְתְּ]	
	1. c.	קָצַחְתִּי	קָצַחְתִּי	קָצַחְתִּי	
	Plur.	3. c.	קָצְחוּ	קָצְחוּ	קָצְחוּ
		2. m.	קָצַחְתֶּם	קָצַחְתֶּם	קָצַחְתֶּם
		2. f.	[קָצַחְתֶּן]	[קָצַחְתֶּן]	[קָצַחְתֶּן]
	1. c.	קָצַחְנוּ	קָצַחְנוּ	קָצַחְנוּ	
Inf.		קָצַח	הִקָּצַח	קָצַח	
Inf. absol.		קָצֹחַ	נִקְצַח	קָצַח	
Imp. Sing.	m.	קָצַח*	הִקָּצַח	קָצַח	
	f.	קָצְחִי	[הִקָּצְחִי]	[קָצְחִי]	
	Plur. m.	קָצְחוּ	הִקָּצְחוּ	קָצְחוּ	
		f.	קָצַחְנָה*	[הִקָּצַחְנָה]	[קָצַחְנָה]
Impf. Sing.	3. m.	יִקְצַח*	יִקְצַח	יִקְצַח	
	3. f.	תִּקְצַח	תִּקְצַח	תִּקְצַח	
	2. m.	תִּקְצַח	תִּקְצַח	תִּקְצַח	
	2. f.	תִּקְצְחִי	תִּקְצְחִי	[תִּקְצְחִי]	
	1. c.	אִקְצַח	אִקְצַח	אִקְצַח	
	Plur.	3. m.	יִקְצְחוּ	יִקְצְחוּ	יִקְצְחוּ
		3. f.	תִּקְצַחְנָה*	תִּקְצַחְנָה*	תִּקְצַחְנָה*
		2. m.	תִּקְצְחוּ	תִּקְצְחוּ	[תִּקְצְחוּ]
		2. f.	תִּקְצַחְנָה	תִּקְצַחְנָה	תִּקְצַחְנָה
		1. c.	נִקְצַח	[נִקְצַח]	נִקְצַח
Shortened Impf. (Jussive).					
Impf. with Suff.		יִקְצְחִי, יִקְצַחְנִי		יִקְצְחִי	
Part. act.		קָצַח	נִקְצַח	קָצַח	
pass.		קָצֹחַ			

Verbs, נ'ב.

<i>Pu'al.</i>	<i>Hiph'il.</i>	<i>Hoph'al.</i>	<i>Hithpa'el.</i>
קרא מְצֵא	הִמְצִיא	[הִמְצֵא]	[הִתְמַצֵּא]
מְצָאָה	הִמְצִיָּאָה	הִמְצָאָה	הִתְמַצָּאָה
מְצָאתָ	*הִמְצִאתָ	*[הִמְצָאתָ]	*הִתְמַצָּאתָ
מְצָאתָ	הִמְצָאתָ	הִמְצָאתָ	[הִתְמַצָּאתָ]
מְצָאתִי	הִמְצָאתִי	הִמְצָאתִי	הִתְמַצָּאתִי
מְצָאוּ	הִמְצִיאוּ	הִמְצָאוּ	הִתְמַצָּאוּ
מְצָאתֶם	הִמְצָאתֶם	הִמְצָאתֶם	[הִתְמַצָּאתֶם]
מְצָאתֶן	[הִמְצָאתֶן]	הִמְצָאתֶן	הִתְמַצָּאתֶן
[מְצָאוּ]	[הִמְצָאוּ]	[הִמְצָאוּ]	[הִתְמַצָּאוּ]
wanting.	הִמְצִיא הִמְצָא	wanting.	הִתְמַצֵּא wanting.
	הִמְצָא		[הִתְמַצֵּא]
wanting.	הִמְצִיָּא הִמְצִיאוּ [הִמְצָאָנָה]	wanting.	הִתְמַצָּא הִתְמַצָּאוּ [הִתְמַצָּאָנָה]
יִמְצָא	יִמְצִיא	[יִמְצָא]	יִתְמַצֵּא
[תִּמְצָא]	תִּמְצִיא	תִּמְצָא	תִּתְמַצָּא
תִּמְצָא	תִּמְצִיא	תִּמְצָא	תִּתְמַצָּא
תִּמְצָאִי	תִּמְצִיאִי	תִּמְצָאִי	[תִּתְמַצָּאִי]
אִמְצָא	אִמְצִיא	אִמְצָא	[אִתְמַצָּא]
יִמְצָאוּ	יִמְצִיאוּ	יִמְצָאוּ	יִתְמַצָּאוּ
*תִּמְצָאָנָה	*תִּמְצָאָנָה	*תִּמְצָאָנָה	[תִּתְמַצָּאָנָה]
תִּמְצָאוּ	תִּמְצִיאוּ	תִּמְצָאוּ	תִּתְמַצָּאוּ
תִּמְצָאָנָה	תִּמְצָאָנָה	תִּמְצָאָנָה	[תִּתְמַצָּאָנָה]
[נִמְצָא]	נִמְצִיא	נִמְצָא	[נִתְמַצָּא]
	יִמְצָא		
	יִמְצָאִי		
	מִמְצִיא		מִתְמַצָּא
מִמְצָא		מִמְצָא	

	<i>Qal.</i>	<i>Niph'al.</i>	<i>Pr'el.</i>
<i>Perf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	נָלָה*	נִנְלָה*	נָלָה*
3. <i>f.</i>	נִנְלָתָה*	נִנְלָתָה*	נָלָתָה*
2. <i>m.</i>	נָלִיתָ*	נִנְלִיתָ, יָתָה	נָלִיתָ*
2. <i>f.</i>	נָלִיתְּ	נִנְלִיתְּ	נָלִיתְּ
1. <i>c.</i>	נָלִיתִי	נִנְלִיתִי	נָלִיתִי, נָלִיתִי
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>c.</i>	נָלוּ*	נִנְלוּ	נָלוּ
2. <i>m.</i>	נָלִיתֶם	[נִנְלִיתֶם]	נָלִיתֶם
2. <i>f.</i>	נָלִיתֶנּוּ	[נִנְלִיתֶנּוּ]	[נָלִיתֶנּוּ]
1. <i>c.</i>	נָלִינוּ	נִנְלִינוּ	נָלִינוּ
<i>Inf.</i>	נָלוֹת*	נִהְלוֹת*	נָלוֹת*
<i>Inf. absol.</i>	נָלָה	נִנְלָה, הִנְלָה	נָלָה, נָלָה
<i>Imp. Sing.</i> <i>m.</i>	נָלָה*	נִהְלָה*	נָלָה, נָלָה
<i>f.</i>	נָלִי*	נִהְלִי*	נָלִי*
<i>Plur. m.</i>	נָלוּ	הִנְלוּ	נָלוּ
<i>f.</i>	נָלִינָה*	[הִנְלִינָה]	[נָלִינָה]
<i>Impf. Sing.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִנְלָה*	יִנְלָה*	יִנְלָה*
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּנְלָה	תִּנְלָה	תִּנְלָה
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּנְלָה	תִּנְלָה	תִּנְלָה
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּנְלִי*	[תִּנְלִי]	תִּנְלִי*
1. <i>c.</i>	אִנְלָה	אִנְלָה, אִנְלָה	אִנְלָה
<i>Plur.</i> 3. <i>m.</i>	יִנְלוּ	יִנְלוּ	יִנְלוּ
3. <i>f.</i>	תִּנְלִינָה*	תִּנְלִינָה*	תִּנְלִינָה*
2. <i>m.</i>	תִּנְלוּ	תִּנְלוּ	תִּנְלוּ
2. <i>f.</i>	תִּנְלִינָה	תִּנְלִינָה	תִּנְלִינָה
1. <i>c.</i>	נִנְלָה	[נִנְלָה]	נִנְלָה
<i>Shortened Impf.</i>	יִנְלָה*	יִנְלָה*	יִנְלָה*
<i>Impf. with Suff.</i>	יִנְלִי, יִנְלִי, יִנְלִי		יִנְלִי, יִנְלִי, יִנְלִי
<i>Part. act.</i>	נָלָה*	נִנְלָה*	נָלָה*
<i>pass.</i>	נָלָה		

[illegible]

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

The numbers refer to the pages, except where otherwise indicated. N. = note.

- A-sounds, 38 sq., 42 sq.
 Abbreviations, 28.
 Absolute cases, 482 N. 3.
 Abstract for concrete, 236: expressed by the feminine, 412 sq.: by the plural, 417: with the article, 427.
 Accents, 18: names and laws of, 56 sqq.: of the poetical books, 59 sq.
 Accusative indicated by the termination ל , 260 sqq.: by לם , 379 sqq.: use of, 379 sqq.: accusative of the object, 379 sqq.: double accus., 388 sqq.: accus. of the product or result, 389 sqq.: looser subordination to the verb, 391 sqq.: accus. of place, 391 sq.; of time, 392 sq.; of cause, 393: adverbial, 393 sqq.: accus. after a passive verb, 408.
 Adjectives expressing condition, 393: periphrases for, 437 sq., 462, 475 sq.: with the article, 429: in connexion with the substantive, 448 sqq.: as predicate in a noun-clause, 490 sq.
 Adverbs, 305: expressed by the verb, 366 N. 3, 406 sq.: with suffixes, 307 sq.
 Adversative clauses, 527.
 Affirmatives of the imperfect, 127 sqq.: of the noun, 245 sqq.
 Agreement of members of a sentence in gender and number, 486 sqq.
 Alphabet, old Hebrew, 12, 23 sqq.: origin of, 26 sq.
 Alphabetic poems, 27.
 Anacoluthon, 533.
 Answers, affirmative, 501: negative, 501, 504.
 Aphaeresis, 67 sq., 178 sqq., 194 sq.
 Apocope, 68: in verbs הָוָה , 222.
 Aposiopesis, 532 sq.
 Apposition, 433, 443 sqq.: in the wider sense, 447.
 Arabic language and Arabisms, 2, 7 sq., 78, 80, 112, 121 sq., 128.
 Aramaic language and Aramaisms, 2, 7, 14-16, 80 sq., 102 sq., 122, 128 N. 2 and 3: Pi'el, 143: Nûn epentheticum, 162: Aramaic forms of verbs יָצָא , 183 sq.; of verbs יָצָא , 205; of verbs הָוָה , 224: Aramaic termination of the fem., 233 sq.; of the plural, 252.
 Archaisms, supposed, in the Pentateuch, 13.
 Article, 110 sqq.: syntax of, 424 sqq.: with demonstrative force, 424: determining the class, 426 sq.: in comparisons, 427: with the attribute, 429: used as a relative, 469 sq.
 Ashdod, language of, 17.
 Aspirates, 31 sq., 54, 73 sq.
 Asseverations, 497.
 Assimilation, 67, 153, 180 sq.: of ל and ל , 200 sq.: 'Rückwärts-Assimilation,' 63.
 Assyrian language, 2 N. 1, 2.
 Asyndeton, *see* Construction.
 Attribute, its determination, 429 sqq.: its connexion with the substantive, 448 sqq.
 Attributive ideas expressed by כִּי , וְכִי , וְעַל , 437 sq.; by the genitive, 462; by a substantive, 475 sq.: negative, expressed by a noun-clause, 507.
 Babylonian punctuation, 40 N. 1.
 B'gadk'phath, 19, 31, 53, 73 sqq.
 Canaanitish glosses in the cuneiform tablets of Tell el-Amarna, 11 N. 2.
 Cardinal numbers, 298 sqq.
 Case-terminations, remains of, 259 sqq.
 Cases absolute, 482 N. 2: instrumental, 486 N. 1.
 Casus pendens, 378, 482, 521.
 Causal clauses, 322, 352 sq., 518 sq.
 Chaldee, incorrect use of the term, 2.
 Changes of consonants, 66 sqq.
 Chiasmus in the arrangement of words

- in parallel members of a verse, 368 N., 480 N. I.
- Circumstantial clauses, 474 sq., 515 sqq.: noun-clauses, 515 sq.: verbal, 479, 516 sq.
- Citation, formulae of, 499.
- Cohortative, 131 sqq., 331 sqq.
- Coins, Hebrew, 10.
- Collectives, 414, 415 sqq.; their syntax, 487: with the plural of the attribute, 449 sq.: with the plural of the predicate, 487.
- Common gender, 410.
- Comparatio decurtata, 394 N. I., 452 N. I.
- Comparative, expression of, 450 sqq.
- Comparative clauses, 526 sq.
- Compensatory lengthening, 83, 89.
- Composition of words, 104, 235, 503 N. I.; of particles, 305.
- Compound ideas in the plural, 420 sq.: with the article, 432 sq.: with suffixes, 462.
- Compounds formed by \aleph with a substantive or adjective, 503 N. I.
- Concessive clauses, 525 sq.
- Condition, adjectives expressing, 393.
- Conditional sentences, 331, 336, 351 sq., 519 sqq.
- Conjugations, or verba derivativa, 115 sqq.: number and arrangement of, 117 sq., 139 sqq.: the less common conjugations, 155 sqq.
- Conjunctions, 316 sqq.
- Consecutio temporum, 135, 344 sq.
- Consecutive clauses, 331, 531.
- Consonants, 23 sqq.: changes of, 66 sqq.: pronunciation and division of, 28 sqq.: transcription of their names, 26 N. 2: 'weak' consonants, 33: softening of, 69.
- Constructio ad sensum, 487: asyndetos, 406, 501 N. I. (a): praegnans, 401 sqq.
- Contraction of vowels, 33 sq.; of consonants, 69 sq.
- Co-ordination of verbal ideas instead of subordination, 405 sq.
- Copula, *see* Wāw copulativum: verbal, how expressed, 476 sq.
- Cuneiform inscriptions, Assyro-Babylonian, 2 sq., 6 N. I., 7 N. I.
- Dageš forte, 53 sq., 67: orthophonicum, 54: necessarium, compensativum, characteristicum, euphonicum, 69: conjunctivum, 70: dirimens, 71 sq.: affectuosum, firmativum, 72: implicitum, 75 sq.: omission of, 72 sq.; in the gutturals, 75; in \aleph , 78; in verbs $\aleph''\aleph$, 189 sq.
- Dageš lene, 53, 54, 73 sq.
- Dative, 400.
- Dativus commodi (and ethicus), 400: expressed by a suffix, 387.
- Desiderative sentences, 501 sqq.
- Determination of nouns, 421 sqq.: omission of, 384 sq., 429 sq.: determination of proper names, 422 sq.: determination by the article, 424 sqq.: by a following determinate genitive, 431 sqq.: determination of numerals, 456 sq.
- Diminutives, 250 N. I.
- Diphthongs, 33, 44 sq., 81 sqq.
- Distributive numerals, 458.
- Doubling (or sharpening) of consonants, 53 sq., 67 sqq.: in gutturals, 75 sqq.: virtual doubling, 76: serves to intensify the idea of the stem, 144: virtual doubling of \aleph , 175 sq.: omission of the doubling in verbs $\aleph''\aleph$, 183 sq., 189 sq.
- Dual, 255 sqq.: with the plural of the attribute, 449; of the predicate, 489: in the numerals, 302, 458.
- E-sounds, 33 sq., 38, 44 sq.
- Elative, 246, 450 N. 3.
- Ellipse of the pronominal object, 382: other cases of ellipse (real or apparent), 377, 394, 395 N. I., 456 sq., 486, 511 N. I.
- Emblematic Mashal, 526 N. I.
- Emphasis on indeterminate nouns, 384 sq., 422.
- Enallage of the gender, 463, 483.
- Epicene nouns, 410.
- Epithets, poetical, used as substantives, 448 N. 3.
- Era, Jewish, 28.
- Ethiopic, 2.
- Exceptive clauses, 527 sq.
- Exclamations, 492, 495 sq., 502 sq.
- Extension, plurals of, 417.
- Feminine, terminations of the, 232 sqq.: formation of, 286 sqq.: in the constr. state, 259: in the plural, 253 sqq.: paradigms, 288 sqq.: use of the fem. form for abstracts and collectives, 412 sqq.: dislike of using the fem. form, 449, 490 sq.: fem. forms of the infinitive, 125, 179, 181, 194 sq.
- Feminine pronoun = English *it*, 463, 483 sq.
- Figura etymologica, *see* Schema etymologicum.
- Final clauses, 330, 335 sq., 530 sq.
- Formae mixtae, 230.
- Formative letters, or litterae serviles, 100, 235, 245 sqq.
- Future tense, 127 N. I.: futurum exactum, 324, 328.

- Ga'ya, 62 sqq.
 Ge'ez, 2.
 Gender of nouns, 409 sqq.: in the connexion of subject and predicate, 486 sqq.
 Genitive, expression of, 258 sq., 434 sqq.: epexegetical, 436, 439: subjective, 436, 462: objective, 436, 462: partitive, 436: explanatory, 436 sq.: periphrasis for, 439 sqq.
 Gentile names, 251, 422, 432.
 Geographical names connected with a genitive, 423.
 Gerund, 125.
 Government of the verb, 379 sqq.
 Gutturals, 29 sq., 32, 75 sqq., 169 sqq.
 Hāteph-Pathah, 50 sq.: shorter than Hāteph-Sghōl, 92, 171.
 Hāteph-Qames, 51 sq.
 Hāteph-Sghōl, 50.
 He interrogative, 307, 498 sqq.
 Hebrew language, 1, 8 sqq.: remains of the literature, 9 sq., 13 sqq.: dialects of, 17: resources of, 17: grammatical treatment of, 17 sqq.: system of writing, 12, 23 sqq.
 Hebrews, 8 sq.
 Helping vowels, 45, 93, 238 sq., 276.
 Himyaritic, 2.
 Hiph'il, 147 sqq.
 Hireq, different kinds of, 38, 44 sq.: compaginis, 263.
 Hithpa'el, 153 sqq.: sometimes governs an accusative, 386 sq.
 Hithpa'el, 156.
 Hithpalpel, 157.
 Holem, 39 sq., 45 sqq.
 Homogeneous consonants, 32: vowels, 81 sqq.
 Homorganic consonants, 32.
 Hoph'al, 147 sqq.
 I-sounds, 38, 44 sq.: for *a*, 128, 139, 143, 147, 246, 277.
 Imperative, 125 sq.: shortened and lengthened forms of, 134, 218: with suffixes, 167 sqq.: syntax of, 337 sqq.: other tenses and moods used instead of it, *see under* Jussive and Infinitive absolute (362).
 Imperfect, the name, 127 N. 1: formation and inflexion of, 127 sqq.: shortened and lengthened forms of, 131 sqq.: with wāw consecutive, 135 sqq., 339 sqq.: with suffixes, 165 sqq.: its syntax, 325 sqq., 339 sqq.
 Impersonal construction of הָיָה, &c., 483.
 Imprecation, formulae of, 497.
 Indefinite subject, how expressed, 484 sq.
 Indogermanic languages compared, 3, 4 sq., 50 N. 1, 72 N. 1, 75 N., 91 N. 2, 103, 108, 140, 144 N. 2, 149 N., 157 N. 1, 304, 448 N. 3, 451 N. 2, 461 N. 1, 464 N. 1, 488 N. 1, 490 N. 2, 500 N. 2, 511 N.
 Infinitive, 124 sqq.: with suffixes, 167 sqq.: use of the infin. abs., 355 sqq.; as a casus adverbialis, 356 sqq.; to strengthen the idea of the verb, 357 sqq.: in place of the finite verb, 361 sqq.: syntax of the infin. constr., 363 sqq.: infinitive construction continued by a finite verb, 368: connexion with subject and object, 369 sqq.
 Instrument, introduced by הָ, 399: accusative as a supposed casus instrumentalis, 485, 486 N. 1.
 Intensification of attributive ideas, 450 sqq.
 Interjections, 103, 318 sq.: syntax of, 496.
 Interpunctuation, the accents as marks of, 57, 61.
 Interrogative sentences, 330 sq., 498 sqq.: disjunctive, 500: indirect, 500 sq.: expressing a wish, 502.
 Interrogative words and particles, 498 sqq.
 Involved series of sentences, 533.
 Jussive, 131 sq., 133 sq., 334 sqq.: in conditional sentences, 336, 520: purely rhythmical jussive forms, 336.
 Kaph veritatis, 395.
 Kethibh, 64.
 Lamentation metre, 15.
 Letters, forms and names of, 23 sqq.: final, 25 sq.
 Litterae dilatabiles, 26: majusculae, minusculae and suspensae, 28: spirantes, 31 sq.: liquidae, 32: quiescibiles, 41, 78 sqq.: incompatibiles, 102 N.: serviles, 100, 235: compaginis, 263.
 Loan-words in Hebrew and Greek, 5.
 Locative, 261 sqq.
 Mandaeans, 2.
 Mappiq, 42 N. 1, 53, 55.
 Maqqēph, 48, 62.
 Masculine as prior gender, 410 sq., 493.
 Masora and Masoretic text, 18 sq.
 Material, expressed by the genitive, 437, 462.
 Matres lectionis, 41 N. 1.
 Mēša' inscription, 2, 9 sq.: final vowels in, 34: מִן = מִן, 106 N. 1: הָ = הָ, 107 N. 1: wāw consecutive, 135 N. 1: the forms הִלְחֹתִים, &c., 155;

- נחבב, 195 N.; נחבב, 215 N.: fem. sing. abs. in נחבב, 233 N. 2; plur. masc. in נחבב, 252 N. 3; suffixes, 268 N.: the imperfect, 325 N. 3; impf. consec., 341 N.: article omitted with נחבב, 430: use of the separate pronoun, 460 N. 1: casus pendens, 482 N. 1.
 Metathesis, *see* Transposition.
 Metheg, 48, 57, 62 sqq., 71, 86 sq., 94, 138.
 Mil'el and Milra', 57, 70 sq.
 Mixed forms, 230.
 Moods, expression of, 118, 320 sqq.: modus rei repetitae, 327.
 Multiplicatives, 458.
 Nabataean inscriptions, 2.
 Names, proper, 411: with the article, 422: with a following genitive, 423.
 Negative sentences, 503 sqq.
 Negatives, 503 sqq.: several in a sentence, 508: affecting a following clause, 508 sq.
 Neuter, wanting in Hebrew, 232, 413 N. 1.
 Niph'al, 139 sqq.
 Nomen regens and rectum, 258 sq.
 Nota accusativi, 158 sq., 379 sqq.
 Noun-clauses, 376 sqq., 473 sq., 474 sqq.: shortened unusually, 496: negated by ין and מן, 503 sqq.: relative, 512.
 Nouns, derivation and various kinds of, 235 sqq.: primitive, 100, 231, 235 sq.: denominative, 250 sq.: with pronominal suffixes, 265 sqq.: paradigms of, 273 sqq.: peculiar forms, 293 sqq.: syntax of, 409 sqq.: appellatives, 411 sq., 422 sq.: nomina unitatis, 414: abstracts, 412 sq.
 Number in the connexion of subject and predicate, 486 sqq.
 Number of words in the Old Testament, 17 N.
 Numeral adverbs, 458 sq.
 Numerals, 298 sqq.: syntax of, 454 sqq.
 Numerical sayings, 459.
 Numerical signs, 27 sq.
 Nûn paragigmaticum, 130 sq.: assimilation of Nûn, 67, 180 sq.: energicum (demonstrativum, epentheticum), 161 sq.: inversum, 28.
 O-sounds, 39, 45 sqq.
 Oaths, formulae of, 497.
 Object, in the accusative, 379 sqq.: introduced by ו, 483 sq.: absolute, or internal, 384 sq.: remoter obj. expressed by accusative suffixes, 387.
 Object-clauses, 517 sq.
 Old Hebrew, 6, 8 sqq.
 Onomatopoeica, 4, 101 sq.
 Optative, 334.
 Oratio obliqua, 517.
 Order of words, 368 N. (chiasmus): in noun-clauses, 477 sq.: in verbal-clauses, 478 sqq.: with the infinitive, 370 sq.
 Ordinal numbers, 302 sq., 457 sq.
 Pa'lél, 156.
 Parallelism, poetic, 14, 500.
 Participles, 138 sq., 326: with suffixes, 169, 374 sq.: syntax of, 372 sqq.: passive, 375 sq., 378: participial construction continued by a finite verb, 379.
 Particles, 304 sqq.
 Passive, 117 sq., 140 sq.: probable passive of Qal, 144, 147, 152: construction of passives, 407 sqq.: expressed by means of the active participle, 485 N. 1.
 Pathah, 38, 43 sq.: preferred with gutturals, 76: furtive, 40, 76, 177 sq.: as a helping-vowel, 91, 93 N. 4, 238 sq.: in the imperfect of verbs נחבב, 220, 223: in pause for šere or s'ghôl, 97 sq., 142: in Pi'el for šere, 143.
 Patronymics, 251.
 Pause, 96.
 Pe'al'al, 156.
 Pentateuch, linguistic character of, 13.
 Perfect, 118, 120 sqq., 127 N.: with wâw consecutive, 135 sqq., 137 sq., 344 sqq.: with ו as a narrative tense, 353 sq.: as a frequentative tense, 345 sq., 350 sq.: with suffixes, 162 sqq.: syntax of it, 320 sqq.: not precativae, 324 N. 2: perfectum 'confidentiae,' 324: propheticum, 324.
 Permutative, 446 sq.
 Phoenician and Punic language, 2, 11, 50 N. 1, 106 N. 1, 113 N. 2, 135 N. 1, 233, 252: writing, 6, 34 N. 2.
 Phonetic system, Hebrew, 32.
 Phonetics, 28 sqq.
 Pi'el, 142 sqq.
 Pi'lél, 156.
 Pilpél, 157.
 Pleonastic use of the pronoun, 460: of the negative, 508.
 Pluperfect, 321 sq.: pluperf. conjunctive, 324 sq.
 Plural, terminations of, 252 sqq.: double plurals, 255: use of, 416 sqq.: construction of, 488 sq.: plural forms of prepositions, 314 sq.: plural suffix referring to collective singular, 463.
 Pluralis excellentiae or maiestatis, 418 sq.: its construction, 450: plural of extension, 417: intensive, 417 sq.: of the result or product, 420.

Plurals of compound ideas, 420 sq.
 Plurals of names of animals or things, construed with the fem. sing., 488.
 Pô'el, 155 sq.
 Poetic style, 14.
 Polpal, 157.
 Polysyndeton, 509 N. 1 (a).
 Potential sense of the imperfect, 330 sq.
 Precative, 334.
 Predicate, without the article, 426: its connexion with the subject, 486 sqq.: attracted to the principal idea of a compound subject, 492 sq.
 Prefixes, *see* Prepositions.
 Preformatives of the imperfect, 127 sqq.: of the noun, 245 sqq.
 Prepositions, 308 sqq.: prefixed prepositions, 309 sqq.: under the government of the verb, 395 sqq.: compound, 396 sqq.
 Present, expressed by the perfect, 322 sq.
 Preterite, *see* Perfect.
 Pretonic vowels, 85, 310, 312.
 Prohibitions, expressed by לֹא or אַל with the jussive or imperf., 329, 334 sq., 505.
 Pronominal ideas expressed by substantives, 470 sqq.
 Pronouns, 105 sqq.: syntax of, 459 sqq.: personal, 105 sqq., 459 sq.: oblique cases of, 461: suffixes, 108 sq.; with the verb, 159 sqq.; with the noun, 265 sqq.; with adverbs, 307 sq.; with prepositions, 311 sqq.; referring to entire sentences, 463; demonstrative, 109 sq., 464 sq.; used relatively, 469 sq.: relative, 113, 466 sq.: indefinite, 113 sq.: interrogative, 113 sq., 466: reflexive, 461: possessive, 109, 462: as genitive, subjective or objective, 462: separate pronouns emphasizing a suffix, 460 sq.
 Pronunciation of Hebrew, 28 sqq., 133.
 Prosthesis, 68.
 Pu'al, 143 sq., 145 sqq.
 Pu'lal, 156.
 Puncta extraordinaria, 28.
 Punctuation, Babylonian, 40 N. 1.
 Punic, *see* Phoenician.
 Qal, form and meaning of, 120 sqq.: probable passives of, 144, 152 sq.
 Qameç, 38, 42 sq.: its pronunciation, 39: Qameç impurum, 84.
 Qameç-hatuph, 39, 47: how distinguished from Qameç, 47 sqq.
 Qerê, 64 sq.: perpetuum, 65.
 Qibbus, 39, 45 sq.
 Quadriliterals, 102 sq.: nouns, 249: verbs, 158.
 Quantity of vowels, 38 N. 4.

Questions, double, 500 sq.
 Quiescent letters, *see* Letters.
 Quinqueliterals, 102 sq., 249.
 Radical letters, 99 sq.
 Raphe, 31, 55.
 Relation of different kinds of weak verbs to one another, 225 sq.
 Relative clauses, 511 sqq., 515: after the constr. state, 442 sq.
 Relative pronoun, 113, 466 sq.
 Repetition of words to express entirety, or in a distributive sense, 415 sq.: to express the superlative, 453.
 Rhythm of Hebrew poetry, 14 sq.
 Roots, 100 sq.
 Sabeian, 2, 6 N. 1.
 Samaritan, 2.
 Schema etymologicum, 384 sq.
 Scriptio plena and defectiva, 41 sq., 83 sq.
 Seal-stones, engraved, 10.
 Sêghôl, 38 sq., 44 sq., 90 sqq.: as a helping-vowel, 91, 93, 238: in the imperfect of verbs הָיָה , 216 sq., 220: with gutturals, 77: before gutturals with Qameç, 91: in pause for שֶׁרֶה in Pi'el, 146.
 Segholate forms of nouns, 233 sqq., 276 sqq.
 Semitic languages, 1 sqq.: their grammatical structure, 3 sq.: their relation to one another, 3, 7 sq.; and to other languages, 4 sq.: their age, 6 sqq.
 Semitic writing, 5 sq.
 Sentences, 473 sqq.: compound, 473, 481 sqq.: incomplete, 494 sqq.: restrictive and intensive, 509: connected by Wāw, 509 sqq.
 Separating vowels, 183 N., 204 sq.
 Šere, 38, 44 sq.: in pause for sêghôl in verbs הָיָה , 224.
 Servile letters, *see* Formative letters.
 Šwâ, simple and compound, 49 sqq., 74 sq., 77 sq., 81 sq., 170 sq.: medium, 49 sq., 89 sq.: mobile, 49 sqq., 72, 74, 77, 89 sq.: simple, under gutturals, 77, 170, 178: quiescent (silent, syllable-divider), 52, 77, 81 sq., 89.
 Sibilants, 30 sq.: transposition (metathesis) of, 68 sq., 153.
 Silluq, with Soph pasuq, 57.
 Siloam inscription, 10, 34 sq.
 Simultaneity of actions expressed by noun-clauses, 528.
 Singular, distributive, 489.
 Softening of consonants, 69.
 Spirants, 31 sq.
 Square character, 23 sq.

Stem-consonants, or radicals, 100 sq.
 Stems, to be distinguished from roots, 99 sqq.
 Status absolutus of the noun, 258.
 Status constructus, its form, 258 sq.: its use, 434 sqq.: wider use of it, 441 sqq.: before prepositions, 441 sq.: before relative clauses, 442: with the article, 432 sq.
 Subject, omitted in participial clauses, 377: peculiarities in the representation of the subject, 483 sqq.: two subjects in a verbal-clause, 485 sq.: construction of compound subjects, 492 sq.
 Substantive, its connexion with the adjective, 448 sqq.: as predicate of a noun-clause, 474 sq.
 Suffixes, *see* Pronoun: their syntax, 462 sqq.: heavy (or grave) and light, 164, 270, 273: masculine suffixes referring to feminines, 463.
 Superlative, expression of, 452 sq.
 Šureq, 39, 45 sq.
 'Surface'-plurals, 417.
 Syllables, theory of, 84 sqq.
 Syncope, 68, 112 sq., 142, 152: of the article, 112 sq.: of the ׀ in Hiph'il and Hoph'al, 147.
 Syriac language, 2.
 Syriasms in pronunciation, 82: cf. Aramaisms.
 Tell el-Amarna tablets, 11.
 Temporal clauses, 322, 340, 353, 528 sqq.: expressed by infin. constr. with a preposition, 530.
 Tenses, 118 sqq.: use of, 320 sqq.: tempus historicum, 321.
 Text of the Old Testament probably derived from a single archetype, 18.
 Titles indicated by the feminine form, 413.
 Tone of Hebrew words, 94 sqq.: marks of, 56 sq., 60 sq.

Transition from one person to another, 483.

Transposition (metathesis) of consonants, 68 sq., 153.

U-sounds, 39, 45 sq.

Verb, 115 sqq.: its syntax, 320 sqq.: its government, 379 sqq.: weak verbs, 119, 178 sqq.: verbs middle E and middle O, 120: derivative, *see* Conjugations: denominative, 115, 120, 141, 145, 149, 154: transitive and intransitive, 120, 386: with suffixes, 158 sqq.: doubly weak, 226 sqq.: defective, 229 sq.: verba induendi et exuendi, 387: copiae et inopiae, 387 sq.: with prepositions, 395 sqq.

Verbal-clauses, 473 sq., 478 sqq.: relative, 512 sqq.

Verbal ideas under the government of the verb, 404 sq.: co-ordinated with a verb, 405 sq.

Verse arrangement of poetic passages, 15.

Vocalization of the text, 36 sq.: Babylonian, 40 N., 314 N.

Vocative with the article, 425.

Vowel letters, 33 sqq., 41 sq.

Vowel signs or points, 36 sqq.

Vowels, 33 sqq., 83 sq., 84 sqq.: firm or immovable, 83 sq.: changes in them as regards quantity, 87 sqq.: impure, 84 N. I.

Wāw adaequationis, 526 N.: apodosis, 482: concomitantiae, 510 N. (b): consecutive, 135 sqq.; with the perfect, 137 sq.; with the imperfect, 136 sq.: copulative, 317 sq., 509 sqq.: explicativum, 510 N. (b).

Weak consonants, 33: N and ׀, 78 sqq.: ׀ and ׀, 81 sqq.: weak verbs, 119, 178 sqq.

Weakening (or softening) of consonants, 69.

׀, as a consonant and guttural, 29 sq., 75 sqq., 78 sqq.: prefers Hāteph-Šeghōl, 78, 128: as a weak sound, 78 sqq., 190 sqq.: as a vowel letter, 80: interchanges with ׀, 1, 1, 79: dropped, 80: prosthetic, 68: virtually doubled, 175 sq.

׀, 311, 463, 464 N. I.

׀, 317, 498 sq., 527.

׀, 307, 326.

׀, preposition with suffixes, 316.

׀ woe! 318: a negative, 506.

׀, 496.

׀, 477, 503, 505 sq.

׀, 329, 503, 505.

׀, 315, 396 sq.

׀, 423, 450, 488.

׀ (׀-׀), to be distinguished from ׀ in desiderative clauses, 502 sq.: in conditional clauses, 521 sqq.: ׀ in

double questions, 500 : as a particle of asseveration, 497 sq.
 אָף, 509.
 אֵשֶׁר, as a relative pronoun, 113, 466 sqq., 511 sqq. : as a conjunction, § 157. c, § 158, § 164. d, § 165. b, § 166. b : אֲשֶׁר, 441.
 אַת, the nota accusativi, 311 sq., 379-383 : the preposition, 311.
 אֶתִּי מִרְחִיק, 70 sq.
 בְּ, the preposition, 309, 312 sq., 398 sqq. : בְּ essential, 398 : partitive, 399 : pretii, 399 : instrumental, 399 sq.
 בִּין, preposition with suffixes, 315 sq.
 בְּלֹא, to negative an infinitive, 368.
 בָּטוּל, 314.
 בָּם, 509.
 בְּרִחִיק, 70.
 בְּרִמָּה, 420.
 ה, with Mappiq, 53, 55, 80 sq. : as a weak letter, 80 sq. : interchanges with ו and י, 81 : as a mere vowel letter, 30, 33 sq., 80 sq., 82, 216 sq.
 ה, the article, 110 sqq., 424 sqq.
 הִי interrogative, 307, 498 sqq.
 הִי, the termination of the cohortative and imperative, 132, 134 : in the noun, 232 sq., 260 sqq., 277.
 הוּא (הִיא), 65, 107 sq. : how different from הֵן, 464 : הוּא and הֵן to emphasize a question, 465, 501.
 הִיא (and הִיא), 63, 173 sq., 220 : with the participle, 377 : with ל before an infinitive, 365 sq. : as the copula, 477.
 הַיּוֹם one day, 428.
 הֵלֵא in assertions, 499.
 הֵלֵךְ, 199, 359 sq.
 הֵן שֶׁ, 524.
 הֵן, הֵנָּה, 308, 494 sq.
 הִרְבֵּה, 357.
 ו, as a vowel letter, 25 N. 1, 33 sqq., 41 sq., 45 sq., 81 sqq., 84 sq. : as a firm consonant in the verb, 210, 215.
 וְ (ו'), see Wāw copulative, consecutive, &c.

וְהִיא as a prophetic formula, 349 sq.
 וְהִיא as a narrative formula, 340 sq.
 וְ with the perfect, 123 : with the imperfect, 130 sq.
 וְה, וְהָא, 109 sq., 464 sq. : as a relative pronoun, 469 sq.
 וְ, demonstrative, 110 : relative, 469 sq.
 וּ, virtually doubled, 76.
 וְהִיא (see וְהִיא), 228.
 וְ with the imperfect, 326.
 י, as a vowel letter, 25 N. 1, 33 sqq., 39 sqq., 81 sqq. : pronunciation, 81 sq., 128 N. 1.
 יְהִי, 65 : how pronounced with prefixes, 311 : יְהִי עֲבָאוֹת, 423.
 יְחִידוֹ, 464.
 יֵשׁ, 477 : with suffixes, 307 sq.
 כְּ, with suffixes, 313 : its meaning, 309, 394 sq., 476 N., 513.
 כִּי אֲשֶׁר, 526 sq.
 כִּי, corroborative, 525 : as a conjunction, § 157, § 158, § 159. aa and ee, § 163, § 164. d, § 166. b.
 כִּי אִם, 527.
 כִּי עַל־כֵּן, 518 N. 3-
 כִּל, with a negative, 504 : in connexion with substantives, 381, 431 sq., 492 : with participles, 378 sq.
 כִּטוֹ, 313.
 ל, preposition, 125, 309 sqq. : with suffixes, 312 : its meanings, 309, 400 : as the sign of the dative, 400 : introducing the object, 383 sq. : as the sign of the genitive, 439 sqq. : with the passive, and passive ideas, 409 : Lamed anctoris, 440 : inscriptionis, 400 sq. : distributive, 415 sq. : with the infinitive, 364 sqq.
 לֹא, 305, 503 sq., 506 sqq. : in prohibitions, 329 : with the jussive, 324 sq. : לֹא = that . . . not, 531.
 לוֹ, 502 sq., 521 sq., 524.
 לוֹ (לוֹ), 521 sq., 524.
 לָמָּה, 311, 500.
 לָמוּ, 314.

לָמוֹ (in poetry, for לוֹ and לָהֶם), 312 N. 3.
לָסָה, 180 sq.

נ, as preformative in participles, 143,
147: preformative in nouns, 245 sqq.;
affirmative, 248.

·נ for נָה, 70, 113 sq.

·נ, *see* מָן.

נָה, 70, 113 sq., 466, 496.

נִי, 113 sq., 466: מִי יָחֵן, 502.

נָן, preposition, 308: with suffixes, 314:
its meanings, 401 sq.: with the com-
parative, 450 sqq.

ן, *see* Nûn.

נָא, 319, 334, 337.

נָסוֹן אָחֹר, 95.

נָתַן, 181.

נָבִיבוֹת, קָבִיבִּיב, with suffixes, 315 sq.

ע, its pronunciation, 30: virtually dou-
bled, 76.

עָד, preposition with suffixes, 316.

עָלֵי, preposition, 308, 402 sq., 518 sq.:
with suffixes, 316.

עָלֵי, preposition, 308: with suffixes, 316.

עָשָׂה, 300 N. 2.

עָן, conjunction, 508.

עָל, used as a model of conjugation,
19, 117 N., 119.

קָל *hark*, 492.

ר, 30, 32: doubled, 78.

ש, its pronunciation, 30 sq.

·שְׁ, ·שׁ, the relative pronoun, 113.

ת־, ת־, the feminine termination,
232 sqq., 259.

תָּחַת with suffixes, 316.

INDEX OF PASSAGES.

The references are to the sections and their marginal letters, except where otherwise indicated. N. = note.

Genesis

- 1, 1 . 5 *n*, 21 *b*, 125 *f*,
142 *g*, 145 *h*
2 . 141 *c*, N. 3, 142 *c*
3 109 *b*
4 117 *h*
5 . 29 *e*, 98 *a*, 111 *c*
6 . . . 102 *h*, 116 *r*
7 . 16 *b*, 21 *b*, 138 *b*
8 126 *w*
9 . 75 *t*, 107 *n*, 109 *a*
11 . 20 *f*, 53 *n*, 117 *r*
12 20 *f*, 91 *d*
14 . 112 *q*, 145 *o*, 145 *s*
16 133 *f*
20 15 *m*, 117 *s*
21 . 91 *d*, 91 *k*, 117 *c*,
126 *x*
22 64 *g*, 96
24 90 *n*
26 . 75 *l*, 122 *s*, 124 *g*,
N. 2
27 . . . 117 *h**h*, 122 *g*
28 110 *c*
29 . 16 *a*, 106 *m*, 141 *n*
30 131 *q*
31 126 *w*
2, 1 111 *k*
2 106 *f*, 138 *a*
3 . . . 114 *o*, 126 *w*
4 . . 5 *n*, 20 *f*, 114 *q*
5 . 106 *f*, 107 *c*, 142 *a*,
152 *h*, 152 *r*
6 . 107 *b*, 107 *d*, 112 *e*,
142 *b*
7 . . . 70 *a*, 117 *h**h*
9 . . . 115 *d*, 127 *b*
10 . 107 *d*, 112 *e*, 141 *a*
11 . 116 *g*, 126 *h*, 134 *k*,
141 *n*
12 10 *g*, 141 *b*
13 . . 26 *o*, N. 1, 98 *a*

Genesis

- 2, 14 118 *g*
15 122 *l*
16 . 26 *o*, N. 1, 113 *p*
17 . 61 *d*, 113 *n*, 114 *b*,
135 *c*, N. 2, 143 *c*
18 75 *l*, 114 *a*
19 . 70 *a*, 107 *k*, 131 *n*,
N. 1, 145 *m*
21 103 *d*
23 . 10 *h*, 20 *c*, 52 *d*,
102 *g*, 125 *i*, 126 *b*,
141 *a*
24 107 *g*, 112 *m*
25 . 72 *m*, 85 *t*, 93 *pp*,
107 *b*, 111 *d*, 134 *d*
3, 1 . 111 *a*, 119 *w*, 142 *c*,
152 *b*
2 107 *s*
3 72 *u*
4 113 *v*
5 . 61 *d*, 112 *oo*, 116 *n*,
131 *t*
6 35 *g*, 116 *e*
7 85 *t*, 93 *pp*
8 118 *p*, 146 *f*
10 142 *f*
11 114 *s*
12 . . 44 *g*, 68 *e*, 135 *c*
13 . 136 *c*, 142 *a*, 148 *b*
14 . 116 *r*, N., 118 *h*,
119 *w*
15 117 *ll*
16 154 *a*, N.
17 10 *g*, 138 *b*
19 . 29 *e*, 95 *c*, 141 *l*
21 60 *g*, 128 *e*
22 . 76 *i*, 107 *q*, 112 *p*,
114 *o*, 124 *g*, N. 2,
130 *a*, 152 *w*
24 128 *h*
4, 2 131 *h*, 142 *d*

Genesis

- 4, 4 . 91 *c*, 106 *d*, 154 *a*, N.
6 20 *f*, 144 *b*
7 145 *u*
9 106 *g*, 150 *d*
10 146 *b*, 148 *b*
12 109 *d*, 114 *m*
13 . 76 *b*, 133 *c*, 141 *m*
14 112 *p*, 116 *g*
15 . 97 *h*, 114 *s*, 115 *k*,
116 *w*, 117 *e*, 134 *r*
16 118 *g*
17 29 *e*
18 121 *b*
20 117 *bb*
22 127 *b*
23 44 *o*, 46 *f*
24 . 29 *g*, 134 *r*, 159 *bb*,
159 *dd*
25 . 94 *u*, 16 *f*, 26 *o*, N. 1,
157 *b*
26 . 107 *c*, 135 *h*, 144 *k*
5, 1 115 *i*, 125 *f*
3 134 *d*
20 134 *k*
23 145 *q*
24 152 *m*
6, 2 117 *h*, 119 *w*
3 67 *p*, 72 *r*
4 . 107 *e*, 112 *e*, 128 *t*
5 146 *c*, 157 *b*
8 142 *b*
9 16 *b*
11 117 *s*
13 117 *s*
14 . 75 *t*, 112 *r*, 117 *ii*,
126 *m*
17 . 112 *t*, 116 *p*, 131 *k*,
N. 2
18 49 *l*, 72 *w*
19 35 *f*
21 107 *g*

Genesis

- 7, 1 . 117*e*, 117*h*, 117*ii*
 2 138*b*
 4 . 112*t*, 116*p*, 118*h*,
 141*a*, 141*f*
 6 164*a*
 7 146*f*
 9 134*g*
 11 . 126*s*, 129*f*, 134*o*
 13 . 97*c*, 104*g*, 139*g*
 15 127*c*
 19 133*k*
 20 118*h*
 21 119*i*
 22 . . 117*b*, 119*w*
 23 . . . 51*n*, 75*o*
 8, 3 . . . 63*f*, 113*u*
 4 124*o*
 5 . . . 129*f*, 134*p*
 7 . 70*a*, N. 2, 113*s*,
 126*r*
 8 150*i*
 9 135*i*
 12 69*t*
 13 . 15*l*, 72*t*, 72*aa*
 14 129*f*
 17 . . . 69*v*, 70*b*
 18 146*f*
 21 72*aa*
 22 . . . 104*g*, 146*d*
 9, 2 135*m*
 3 . . . 117*c*, 138*b*
 4 . . 119*n*, 131*k*
 5 139*c*
 6 . 116*w*, 121*f*, 143*b*
 9 143*a*
 10 . . 116*h*, 143*e*
 11 . . . 121*f*, 152*b*
 14 . 52*d*, 112*y*, 117*r*
 15 159*g*
 16 131*t*
 19 . . . 67*dd*, 134*k*
 20 120*d*
 21 . . . 75*bb*, 91*e*
 22 117*f*
 23 . . . 141*e*, 146*f*
 24 . . . 70*a*, 133*g*
 25 133*i*
 26 . . . 116*r*, N.
 27 75*gg*
 10, 5 139*b*
 9 107*g*
 11 118*e*
 17 35*g*
 19 . . . 91*d*, 144*h*
 21 135*k*
 26 35*m*
 11, 1 141*d*
 3 . . . 117*r*, 141*f*
 4 . . . 107*q*, 152*w*
 5 114*g*

Genesis

- 11, 6 . 67*w*, 67*dd*, 133*d*,
 147*b*
 7 . 67*dd*, 107*q*, 124*g*,
 N. 2, 165*b*
 8 63*f*
 9 144*d*
 10 118*i*
 28 125*k*
 29 146*f*
 30 152*o*
 31 20*f*
 12, 1 . . . 119*s*, 121*c*
 2 . 63*q*, 110*i*, 141*d*
 3 . . . 112*g*, 116*g*
 4 134*k*
 7 116*o*
 8 91*e*, 156*c*
 9 113*u*
 11 114*m*
 12 . 112*c*, 112*y*, 112*hh*
 13 . 110*d*, 112*p*, 141*l*,
 157*a*
 14 . 111*g*, 117*h*, 118*u*
 15 . . . 112*mm*, 118*e*
 16 145*o*
 17 117*q*
 19 . 111*m*, 117*f*, 147*b*
 18, 2 126*m*
 3 . 138*c*, 154*a*, N.
 5 145*o*
 8 131*b*
 9 . 51*n*, 56, 159*dd*
 10 144*h*
 11 139*e*
 12 142*c*
 13 140*a*
 14 104*g*
 15 . . . 142*g*, 143*c*
 16 166*b*
 17 120*g*
 14, 4 . . . 118*i*, 134*o*
 5 134*o*
 6 . . . 93*aa*, 131*f*
 9 134*k*
 10 . 27*q*, 90*c*, 90*i*,
 123*e*, 130*e*
 13 . 2*b*, 126*r*, 128*u*
 17 115*a*
 18 129*c*
 19 . . . 121*f*, 128*a*
 22 106*i*
 23 . 102*b*, 135*a*, 149*c*,
 154*a*, N.
 24 135*c*
 15, 1 . . . 126*r*, 131*q*
 2 . 116*n*, 118*n*, 128
v, 141*e*
 5 150*i*
 6 . 112*ss*, 122*q*, 135*p*
 7 . 29*f*, 66*i*, 138*d*

Genesis

- 15, 10 . . . 139*b*, 139*c*
 12 114*i*
 13 . 113*o*, 135*p*, 155*e*
 14 119*m*
 15 135*a*
 16 118*g*
 17 111*g*
 18 . . . 106*m*, 136*b*
 18, 1 . . . 142*b*, 156*b*
 2 . . . 51*p*, 119*x*
 4 . . . 67*p*, 102*f*
 5 . 5*n*, 103*o*, 135*a*,
 135*m*
 7 . . . 60*d*, 127*e*
 8 . 10*h*, 76*g*, 107*h*,
 116*n*
 10 166*a*
 11 . 80*d*, 94*f*, 116*m*
 12 . 127*c*, 128*l*, 156*b*
 16 115*f*
 17, 5 . . . 121*b*, 163*a*
 8 128*p*
 9 . . . 142*f*, N. 2
 10 113*gg*
 11 . 67*dd*, 112*aa*, 121*d*,
 144*b*
 14 . 29*g*, 67*v*, 112*mm*,
 158*a*, 167*b*, N.
 15 143*b*
 17 . 96, 100*l*, 107*t*,
 134*d*, 150*g*
 19 49*l*
 20 . . . 106*m*, 112*s*
 21 154*a*
 26 72*ee*
 18, 1 . 116*o*, 118*g*, 141*c*
 4 75*ee*
 5 . . . 158*b*, N. 3
 6 . 90*c*, 90*i*, 131*d*
 7 . . . 117*f*, 126*r*
 9 147*b*
 10 118*n*
 11 . . . 116*d*, 146*d*
 12 . 106*n*, 139*f*, 141*e*,
 150*a*, 150*b*
 13 . . . 106*g*, 136*c*
 14 . 133*c*, 139*d*, 141*m*
 15 . . . 106*b*, 163*a*
 17 100*l*
 18 . . . 75*n*, 142*d*
 20 . 128*h*, 148*d*, 159*ee*
 21 . 100*l*, 108*b*, 135*m*,
 138*k*
 24 . . . 117*g*, 122*l*
 25 . 112*v*, 115*b*, 161*c*
 26 112*ff*
 27 141*e*
 28 . 47*m*, 117*aa*, 119*p*,
 134*l*, 159*m*, N.
 29 134*k*

Genesis

19, 1 . 116 *o*, 141 *e*, 141 *f*,
156 *c*
2 . 20 *d*, 20 *g*, 100 *o*,
142 *g*, 150 *n*,
152 *c*
4 . 15 *l*, 107 *c*, 152 *r*,
154 *a*, N., 164 *c*
5 29 *f*
6 93 *i*
8 . 34 *b*, 103 *b*, 139 *d*
9 66 *c*, 113 *r*
11 126 *n*
12 150 *b*
14 20 *g*, 116 *d*
15 152 *w*
16 . 15 *f*, 45 *d*, 55 *g*,
115 *f*
17 107 *g*
18 152 *g*
19 . 60 *d*, 72 *n*, 152 *w*,
154 *a*
20 107 *f*, 109 *f*
21 61 *a*
22 120 *g*
23 164 *b*
28 126 *o*
29 115 *a*, 124 *o*
31 133 *f*, 152 *o*
32 69 *x*, 117 *cc*
33 . 5 *n*, 47 *l*, 61 *c*, 93 *s*,
126 *y*
34 126 *b*
20, 1 90 *c*
5 32 *l*
6 . 66 *b*, 75 *q*, 114 *m*,
157 *b*, N. I
7 63 *g*, 110 *i*
9 107 *w*
10 107 *v*, 166 *b*
11 112 *x*, 153
12 152 *d*
13 . 119 *u*, 124 *h*,
N. I, 141 *f*, 145 *i*,
167 *b*
16 116 *s*, 134 *n*
17 145 *u*
18 106 *f*, 113 *n*
21, 1 111 *g*
3 138 *k*
5 121 *b*, 128 *v*
6 . 10 *g*, 64 *h*, 114 *c*
7 . 106 *p*, 124 *o*, 142 *f*
8 51 *m*
9 52 *n*
10 145 *m*
11 67 *p*
13 143 *c*
14 95 *e*, 128 *q*
16 . 75 *kk*, 108 *b*, 113 *h*,
119 *k*, 119 *s*

Genesis

21, 17 138 *e*
19 117 *cc*
20 131 *b*
23 20 *f*, 51 *o*
24 51 *p*, 135 *a*
26 162 *b*
28 91 *c*, 127 *e*
29 91 *f*, 126 *x*
30 117 *d*, 157 *b*
32 138 *f*
22, 3 135 *i*
5 119 *s*
7 147 *b*
12 116 *g*, 158 *a*
14 130 *d*, N. 3
17 75 *ff*
23 134 *k*
24 111 *h*, 147 *e*
28, 1 134 *d*, 134 *h*
4 . 52 *f*, 122 *f*, 128 *m*
6 . 75 *q*, 119 *x*, 128 *r*,
142 *f*, N. 2, 152 *b*
8 61 *g*
9 119 *p*
10 . 116 *h*, 141 *b*, 143 *e*
11 106 *m*, 152 *c*
13 110 *d*
15 112 *cc*
20 111 *k*
24, 3 128 *a*, 165 *b*
5 100 *n*, 113 *q*
6 51 *n*, 152 *w*
7 138 *a*
8 . 75 *x*, 109 *d*, 126 *y*
9 16 *h*
14 . 112 *bb*, 135 *p*, 167 *c*
15 106 *f*, 107 *c*
18 75 *t*, 120 *d*
19 106 *o*, 164 *b*
20 75 *bb*
21 130 *a*, 150 *i*
22 134 *n*, 156 *b*
23 37 *a*, 118 *g*
26 67 *g*
27 . 75 *ll*, 135 *e*, 143 *b*
29 156 *b*
30 115 *e*, 116 *s*
31 116 *l*
33 73 *f*
37 149 *c*
41 95 *n*
42 159 *v*, 167 *c*
43 112 *s*
44 . 154 *a*, N., 162 *b*
45 135 *a*
49 159 *v*
51 109 *f*, 117 *f*
55 139 *h*, 146 *f*
56 142 *d*
58 150 *n*

Genesis

24, 60 63 *g*, 97 *g*
61 146 *g*
63 114 *f*
65 34 *f*
67 127 *f*
25, 1 120 *d*
5 16 *a*
16 136 *d*
21 51 *n*, 121 *f*
23 119 *ff*
24 23 *f*
26 . 115 *a*, 115 *c*, 115 *e*
31 35 *n*, 48 *i*
34 75 *o*
26, 7 . 144 *p*, N. 2, 147 *a*,
N. I
9 . 148 *b*, 152 *w*, 157 *b*
10 106 *p*, 112 *h*
13 113 *u*, 164 *f*
15 60 *h*, 135 *o*
16 133 *c*
18 . 60 *h*, 111 *q*, 120 *d*
25 76 *c*
28 . 75 *n*, 103 *o*, N. I
29 65 *h*, 75 *hh*
27, 1 . 111 *q*, 114 *d*, 119 *y*
3 118 *e*
4 . 20 *b*, 106 *g*, 108 *d*
7 58 *g*
9 117 *i*
12 112 *p*
13 10 *g*, 141 *f*
19 60 *d*
20 . 114 *n*, 136 *c*, 148 *b*
21 67 *r*, 136 *d*
24 150 *a*
26 10 *g*
28 20 *m*
29 145 *l*
30 . 113 *n*, 164 *b*, N. I
31 72 *t*
33 . 107 *c*, 116 *d*, 117 *q*,
150 *l*, 153
34 . 113 *m*, 117 *q*,
135 *e*
36 . 63 *m*, 136 *d*, 150 *e*
37 . 103 *g*, 117 *ff*, 117
ii, 142 *g*, 150 *l*
38 . 10 *g*, 16 *g*, 100 *l*
39 20 *m*, 119 *c*
41 63 *f*
42 81 *a*, 121 *a*
43 119 *s*
45 . 114 *d*, 114 *r*, 117
aa, 118 *i*, 150 *e*,
154 *a*, N.
28, 2 16 *h*, 90 *i*
3 75 *ll*
4 95 *g*, 114 *g*
6 167 *c*

Genesis

28, 8 111 *d*
 9 119 *aa*, N. 3
 11 126 *r*
 15 106 *o*, 147 *b*
 16 106 *g*
 17 20 *d*
 18 71
 29, 2 111 *e*, 144 *f*
 6 150 *n*
 7 126 *i*, 152 *d*
 9 116 *u*, 129 *h*
 10 . 67 *p*, 75 *gg*, 106 *f*
 14 131 *d*
 15 150 *e*
 17 145 *n*
 18 119 *p*
 19 133 *a*
 21 69 *o*, 165 *a*
 25 142 *g*
 26 107 *g*
 27 121 *b*
 30 133 *b*
 32 60 *d*
 30, 3 51 *g*
 6 26 *g*
 8 . 85 *n*, 117 *g*, 154 *a*,
 N.
 13 106 *n*
 15 114 *a*
 16 126 *y*
 18 17 *c*, 135 *m*
 19 96
 20 117 *ff*
 23 135 *m*
 27 111 *h*, 120 *f*
 29 157 *c*
 31 120 *g*, 120 *h*
 32 112 *mm*
 34 109 *b*, 151 *e*
 37 117 *r*, 123 *b*
 38 . 10 *g*, 47 *h*, 76 *g*,
 95 *f*, 138 *d*, 145 *c*
 39 69 *f*, 145 *p*
 40 . 119 *aa*, N. 3, 142 *f*
 41 91 *f*, 112 *ee*
 31, 6 32 *i*
 7 67 *w*
 8 . 145 *u*, 159 *r*, 159 *s*
 9 135 *o*
 13 127 *f*
 14 146 *g*
 15 113 *r*
 19 67 *ac*
 23 118 *h*
 27 . 63 *c*, 111 *m*, 114 *n*,
 159 *dd*
 28 77 *n*
 29 152 *i*
 30 51 *i*, 113 *p*
 32 59 *g*

Genesis

31, 34 . 111 *g*, 124 *h*, N. 1,
 132 *h*, N. 2.
 35 106 *l*
 36 20 *d*, 37 *d*
 39 . 23 *f*, 74 *h*, 75 *oo*,
 75 *qq*, 90 *l*, 107 *e*
 40 . 67 *cc*, 76 *a*, 104 *g*,
 143 *a*, N. 2, 167 *b*, N.
 41 136 *d*
 42 106 *p*
 44 69 *x*
 45 117 *ii*
 47 1 *c*
 52 149 *c*, 167 *b*
 53 145 *i*
 32, 1 103 *b*, 122 *g*
 3 136 *b*
 5 64 *h*, 68 *f*
 6 . 49 *e*, 104 *g*, 123 *b*
 7 116 *s*
 8 67 *p*, 144 *b*
 9 112 *p*, 145 *u*
 10 116 *o*
 11 . 106 *g*, 119 *n*, 133 *c*
 12 . 119 *aa*, N. 3, 152 *w*,
 156 *c*
 13 107 *w*
 15 134 *c*
 16 . 28 *b*, 122 *c*, 132 *e*,
 135 *o*
 17 123 *d*
 18 . 9 *v*, 10 *g*, 60 *b*,
 64 *f*, 137 *b*
 20 . 20 *f*, 52 *n*, 61 *d*,
 74 *h*, 124 *i*
 25 51 *n*
 27 . 60 *f*, 65 *h*, 163 *c*
 30 107 *h*
 31 . 90 *o*, 111 *e*, 156 *c*,
 157 *b*
 33, 2 146 *e*, N. 1
 3 66 *b*
 4 5 *n*
 5 . 37 *a*, 67 *a*, 117 *ff*,
 137 *a*
 8 147 *a*, N. 1
 10 . 112 *gg*, 158 *b*, N. 3
 11 74 *g*
 13 . 60 *h*, 104 *g*, 122 *c*,
 126 *i*, 135 *o*
 18 118 *n*
 19 134 *g*
 34, 5 112 *ss*
 7 45 *c*, 45 *g*
 8 140 *d*
 15 72 *h*, 119 *p*
 16 44 *o*, 49 *k*
 19 64 *d*
 22 72 *ee*
 23 143 *a*

Genesis

34, 24 145 *d*
 25 118 *g*, 131 *q*
 27 144 *g*
 30 128 *n*, 141 *d*
 31 107 *t*, 118 *v*
 35, 1 65 *e*
 3 116 *a*
 7 . 124 *h*, N. 1, 145 *i*
 8 126 *d*
 11 145 *f*
 13 142 *g*
 14 138 *d*
 22 15 *p*, 45 *g*
 26 121 *b*
 36, 7 133 *c*
 37, 2 126 *s*
 3 112 *h*, 133 *b*
 4 115 *c*
 7 47 *l*, 116 *o*
 8 113 *g*, 150 *h*
 15 107 *f*, 116 *s*
 16 p. 481, N. 1
 17 117 *f*
 18 117 *w*
 19 128 *u*
 21 117 *ll*
 23 117 *cc*
 29 152 *l*
 30 116 *p*, 143 *a*
 33 60 *d*, 103 *w*
 35 118 *n*
 38, 5 112 *uu*
 9 13 *c*, 66 *i*, 159 *e*
 11 118 *g*, 152 *w*
 17 159 *dd*
 21 126 *y*
 24 . 20 *m*, 97 *c*, 116 *s*,
 119 *y*, N. 1
 25 . 32 *l*, 74 *i*, 116 *v*,
 142 *e*
 26 133 *b*, N. 3
 28 144 *d*
 29 20 *d*, 164 *g*
 39, 1 142 *b*
 4 130 *d*, 155 *n*
 5 145 *q*
 6 128 *x*
 8 137 *c*
 9 107 *t*, 112 *p*
 10 123 *c*
 11 35 *n*, 126 *s*
 14 2 *b*, 29 *g*, 64 *g*
 16 72 *ee*
 18 114 *r*
 20 130 *c*
 22 116 *s*
 23 116 *o*, 152 *l*
 40, 4 139 *k*
 5 129 *h*
 7 84 *b* *f*, 87 *t*

Genesis

40, 8 152 o
 9 91 e, 143 d
 10 164 g
 13 72 w
 14 . 105 b, N. 2, 106 n,
 N. 2, 163 d
 15 2 b
 16 135 f
 20 . 69 w, 71, 121 b
 22 144 n
 41, 1 . 116 s, 119 cc, 131 d
 6 116 l
 8 64 b, 122 i
 11 49 e
 12 139 c
 15 152 o, 157 a
 21 91 f, 93 ss
 25 116 d
 26 126 x, 141 k
 28 53 p
 29 156 c
 30 112 x
 33 75 p, 75 h
 39 115 a
 40 118 k
 42 117 cc
 43 . 85 k, 113 z, 129 h
 49 75 ff
 51 52 m
 57 145 e
 42, 1 54 f
 2 109 g
 4 75 rr
 6 126 k
 7 122 q
 9 114 g
 10 163 a
 11 32 d, 91 f
 13 . 133 g, 141 b, 152 m
 16 110 c
 18 110 f
 19 134 d
 25 . 93 m, 116 u, 120 f,
 124 l, 139 c
 28 119 gg
 30 124 i, 126 p
 33 134 d
 35 111 g, 139 c
 36 91 f, 135 p
 37 159 r
 48, 3 113 m, 163 c
 5 116 g, 159 v
 6 150 i, N. 3
 7 . 107 k, 107 d, 113 g,
 150 d
 9 159 o
 10 106 p
 12 . 72 bb, 93 pp, 131 c
 14 29 u, 106 o
 15 20 c, 131 q

Genesis

43, 16 65 b
 17 90 c
 18 116 d
 21 49 e
 26 14 d
 27 141 e, N. 4
 28 67 g
 29 67 n
 33 119 gg
 34 134 r, 144 n
 44, 1 47 m, 138 e
 2 135 n, N. 2
 3 142 e, 144 c
 4 . 138 e, 156 f, 164 b
 5 119 m, N.
 9 112 z, 138 f
 12 156 d
 16 20 d, 58 k
 22 159 g
 23 137 b
 28 113 w
 29 112 k
 33 69 p, 109 b
 34 152 w
 45, 4 138 d
 8 119 h
 14 93 pp
 23 102 g
 46, 2 124 e
 3 69 m
 4 113 w
 22 121 b
 27 121 b, 132 g
 30 108 b
 47, 3 145 r
 6 120 e
 9 128 a
 11 69 v
 17 93 ss
 19 67 p
 21 . 139 e, N. 3, 143 c
 22 112 l
 24 145 u
 48, 1 144 d
 2 144 d, N. 2
 9 . 58 g, 60 d, 61 g
 11 75 n, 115 b
 14 141 e, 156 d
 22 . 96, 106 m, 130 g
 49, 1 75 rr
 3 29 u
 4 . 53 n, 124 b, 144 p,
 147 c
 8 135 e
 10 20 k
 11 . 7 c, 52 l, 90 l, 91 e,
 93 m, 96, 106 k,
 116 x, 118 p
 12 90 l, 93 dd
 13 95 i

Genesis

49, 15 117 b, N. 2
 17 20 k, 109 k
 18 106 g
 21 126 b
 22 . 44 m, 80 g, 96,
 145 k
 23 67 m
 25 117 ff, 119 c
 27 . 29 l, 29 u, 107 g,
 155 f
 30 138 b, N. 3
 50, 13 138 b, N. 3
 15 117 ff, 159 y
 18 58 k
 20 75 n
 25 116 v
 26 . 73 f, 144 d, N. 2

Exodus

1, 1 49 b, N. 2
 7 . 117 z, 121 d, 133 k
 10 . 47 k, 75 rr, 112 y
 12 107 e
 14 119 o
 16 . 67 k, 72 w, 76 i
 18 47 e
 19 112 oo
 20 145 g
 21 135 o
 22 127 b
 2, 1 117 d
 2 117 k
 3 . 20 k, 58 g, 126 m
 4 69 m, 71
 6 131 m
 9 . 69 x, 70 e, 135 m
 10 111 d
 16 75 w
 17 . 60 d, 60 k, 135 o
 20 46 f, 154 b
 8, 2 52 z, 126 r
 3 108 b, 126 v
 8 128 x
 9 117 r
 10 110 i
 11 107 u
 13 112 l
 15 133 l
 28 49 l, 118 p
 19 . 69 x, 157 b, N. 1
 20 63 m
 22 139 b
 4, 1 107 i
 2 37 c
 4 29 g, 64 c
 10 . 61 c, 128 i, 152 d
 12 75 ee
 13 130 d, 155 n
 14 159 g
 21 . . 112 mm, 143 d

Exodus

5, 5	112 cc
7	68 h
10	152 m
11	138 e
16	74 g, 116 l, 152 o
18	163 a
19	57, N. 2, 135 k
21	66 i, 102 f
23	113 v
3, 3	119 i, 144 l, N. 3
6	112 x
10	p. 70, N. 1
14	124 r
28	52 o, 130 d
7, 9	109 h, 159 d
11	131 l
20	119 q
27	52 s
8, 1	20 m, 75 gg
4	63 o
10	123 e
17	117 s
22	150 a, 159 w
9, 4	130 d, 155 n
9	117 s
15	106 p
16	115 e
18	91 e, 127 f
23	63 n, 69 x
27	126 k
31	141 d
10, 1	126 y
3	51 l, 106 h
4	65 e
6	161 b
7	152 r
8	137 a
9	91 k
10	154 a, N.
11	135 p
22	133 i
11, 6	135 o
8	9 v
12, 4	133 c, 139 c
5	128 v
6	88 c
8	154 a, N.
12	124 g
13	159 g
14	67 n
15	20 g, 116 w, 126 w
16	146 c, 152 b
18	134 o
21	46 d
23	126 l, N. 1
27	61 a
31	20 g
34	107 c
39	117 ii
43	119 m

Exodus

12, 48	113 gg
49	145 u
18, 2	52 n
3	113 bb
7	118 k, 121 b
8	138 h
18	67 y
21	53 q
14, 11	61 c, 152 y
20	139 e, N. 3
15, 1	2 s, 20 e, 91 l, 107 c, 146 f
2	58 k, 80 g, 117 b
4	47 m, 128 r
5	58 g, 75 dd
7	116 i
8	15 c
9	117 s, 120 g, N. 2, 154 a, N.
10	35 g
11	20 e, 20 g
12	107 d
13	20 e, 64 d, 138 g
15	107 c
16	20 e, 67 g, 90 g, 132 c, 138 g, 164 f
17	20 h, 155 h
20	47 e, 146 c
21	20 e
24	20 c
26	113 o
16, 2	51 g, 72 ee
6	112 oo
7	32 d, 72 ee, 141 l, N. 2
8	72 ee
12	88 c
14	55 k
16	118 h
20	27 o, 67 n, 121 d, N. 3, 139 h, N. 2
21	123 c, 159 g
22	134 e
23	63 i, 76 d
29	9 l, 69 p, 139 d
32	117 cc
33	20 l, 125 b
17, 1	115 f
3	72 ee, 117 e
4	96
6	49 k
7	152 k
12	141 d, 145 n
14	126 s
18, 4	119 i
5	118 g
9	75 r
14	102 b
18	75 n, 133 c
20	155 d, 155 i

Exodus

18, 21	97 k
22	127 b
23	49 i
26	47 g, 112 g
19, 1	102 f
3	53 n
5	113 o, 134 o, N. 1
8	135 r
13	69 i
18	93 dd
19	113 n
23	72 w, 72 x
20, 2	15 p, 138 d
3	107 o, 132 h
5	60 b, 129 e
8	113 bb
9	118 k
15	107 o
18	116 o
20	135 m, 152 x
25	72 k, 117 kk
21, 2	159 bb
4	145 h, 146 e
5	113 o
8	61 b, 75 ee, 103 g
10	126 r
12	104 g, 112 m, 116 w
13	112 ii
18	47 m
28	117 d, 121 b
29	124 i
31	29 i, N.
35	135 m
36	159 cc
37	47 f, 123 a
22, 1	124 n
3	51 k, 113 o
4	53 n
5	117 q
8	138 e
11	113 o
17	94 d
22	113 m, 163 c, N.
25	135 o
29	60 d
30	131 b
23, 4	21 h
5	63 m
8	107 g
9	158 a
16	61 a
21	51 n, 67 y
22	113 o
24	60 b
26	94 g
27	p. 390, N. 1
28	126 f
30	123 e, 133 k
31	58 g
24, 3	118 q

Exodus

24, 4	134 <i>f</i>
10	139 <i>g</i>
12	154 <i>a, N.</i>
25, 5	52 <i>q</i>
15	135 <i>e, N. 2</i>
29	20 <i>f, 117 hh</i>
31	63 <i>h</i>
33	123 <i>d</i>
35	123 <i>d</i>
40	121 <i>c</i>
26, 3	123 <i>d, 139 e</i>
17	52 <i>s</i>
19	123 <i>d</i>
33	49 <i>h, 53 r, 133 i</i>
27, 11	134 <i>n</i>
28, 9	117 <i>d</i>
10	134 <i>c, N. 1</i>
17	131 <i>d</i>
20	117 <i>y</i>
21	139 <i>c</i>
32	165 <i>a</i>
29, 1	66 <i>g</i>
12	119 <i>w</i>
31	128 <i>p</i>
35	103 <i>b</i>
30, 20	117 <i>y, N.</i>
32	73 <i>f</i>
31, 4	63 <i>i</i>
13	60 <i>f</i>
17	51 <i>m</i>
32, 1	126 <i>aa, 137 c</i>
3	54 <i>f</i>
4	145 <i>i</i>
6	52 <i>n, 113 e</i>
12	150 <i>e</i>
20	108 <i>h</i>
25	5 <i>n, 58 g, 116 i</i>
29	114 <i>p</i>
32	159 <i>dd, 167 a</i>
34	112 <i>oo</i>
33, 3	27 <i>q</i>
6	117 <i>w</i>
7	107 <i>e, 112 e, 113 h</i>
10	112 <i>kk</i>
11	156 <i>c</i>
12	75 <i>gg</i>
13	69 <i>b, 91 k</i>
14	150 <i>a</i>
19	67 <i>ee</i>
20	60 <i>d, 159 gg</i>
23	124 <i>b</i>
34, 1	124 <i>q</i>
10	122 <i>q</i>
19	51 <i>g</i>
24	51 <i>l</i>
34	159 <i>k</i>
36, 1	103 <i>g</i>
32	152 <i>d</i>
38, 3	117 <i>hh</i>
5	95 <i>n</i>

Exodus

39, 18	60 <i>h</i>
23	165 <i>a</i>

Leviticus

1, 1	49 <i>b, N. 2</i>
17	156 <i>f</i>
2, 1	139 <i>d, 145 t</i>
8	144 <i>p, N. 2</i>
4, 2	119 <i>w, N. 2, 139 d</i>
23	69 <i>w</i>
5, 9	75 <i>hh</i>
13	119 <i>w, N. 2</i>
6, 2	91 <i>e</i>
3	128 <i>d</i>
7	113 <i>gg</i>
8	118 <i>g, 135 a, N. 2</i>
9	118 <i>k</i>
7, 8	117 <i>d</i>
35	53 <i>l, 155 l</i>
8, 11	76 <i>c</i>
16	91 <i>c</i>
9, 6	107 <i>q, 120 c</i>
10, 10	114 <i>p</i>
19	75 <i>rr, 100 k</i>
11, 7	67 <i>g</i>
23	88 <i>f</i>
35	53 <i>u</i>
42	5 <i>n</i>
43	74 <i>k</i>
44	54 <i>k</i>
13, 4	91 <i>d</i>
19	131 <i>i</i>
34	127 <i>e</i>
14, 36	101 <i>a</i>
43	53 <i>l</i>
46	53 <i>l</i>
55	54 <i>h</i>
15, 29	53 <i>r</i>
16, 8	30 <i>n</i>
17, 14	145 <i>l</i>
18, 7	75 <i>hh</i>
21	95 <i>q, N.</i>
25	76 <i>h</i>
28	116 <i>s</i>
19, 9	61 <i>d, 142 f, N. 2</i>
16	118 <i>q</i>
28	102 <i>c</i>
20, 7	54 <i>k</i>
10	117 <i>d</i>
14	117 <i>d</i>
19	75 <i>hh</i>
21, 4	67 <i>t</i>
7	126 <i>t</i>
9	67 <i>t</i>
21	142 <i>f, N. 2</i>
23, 17	14 <i>d</i>
22	61 <i>d</i>
39	61 <i>a</i>
24, 22	134 <i>d</i>
25, 5	20 <i>h</i>

Leviticus

25, 10	134 <i>o, N. 2</i>
21	49 <i>h, 75 m</i>
33	145 <i>u, N. 2</i>
36	76 <i>i</i>
26, 15	67 <i>dd</i>
18	52 <i>p</i>
33	52 <i>n</i>
34	67 <i>y, 75 m</i>
37	118 <i>s, N. 1</i>
42	128 <i>d</i>
43	67 <i>y</i>
27, 3	128 <i>d</i>
23	127 <i>i</i>

Numbers

1, 1	49 <i>b, N. 2</i>
2	124 <i>r</i>
16	138 <i>e</i>
47	54 <i>l</i>
2, 33	54 <i>l</i>
3, 1	52 <i>o</i>
9	123 <i>e</i>
26	117 <i>l</i>
46	117 <i>m, 134 k</i>
49	85 <i>t</i>
4, 17	152 <i>n</i>
23	45 <i>g</i>
5, 2	102 <i>i</i>
3	119 <i>e</i>
10	117 <i>m, 139 c</i>
17	128 <i>p</i>
19	110 <i>i</i>
20	167 <i>a</i>
22	53 <i>q, 66 f</i>
27	112 <i>y</i>
6, 7	74 <i>b, 96</i>
9	133 <i>k, N. 2, 144 e</i>
26	109 <i>b</i>
7, 2	5 <i>n</i>
12	123 <i>d</i>
8, 7	27 <i>q, 64 d</i>
24	45 <i>g</i>
9, 20	131 <i>e</i>
10, 3	145 <i>c</i>
4	134 <i>r, N. 1</i>
29	138 <i>b</i>
35	5 <i>n</i>
36	118 <i>e</i>
11, 4	35 <i>d, 151 a, N. 1</i>
5	106 <i>g</i>
7	93 <i>h</i>
10	117 <i>h</i>
11	74 <i>k</i>
12	69 <i>s, 122 f, N.</i>
15	32 <i>g</i>
16	48 <i>i</i>
17	119 <i>m</i>
20	80 <i>h</i>
25	23 <i>d, 68 f, 72 q,</i> 120 <i>d, N. 2, 126 x</i>

Numbers	Numbers	Deuteronomy
11, 27 126 r	22, 33 103 b	2, 23 126 w
29 154 b	28, 3 130 c, 137 c	24 . 20 g, 75 cc, 110 h,
12, 1 146 g	7 . 64 c, 67 o, 93 aa	120 g
2 133 h, N. 2	8 58 g	27 . 108 c, 123 e, 133 k,
4 97 i	13 . 20 o, 48 i, 67 o,	156 d
6 128 d	69 x, 152 b	28 49 m
13 105 b, N. 2	15 51 p	31 67 w
14 154 b	18 90 m, 96	34 69 f
18, 27 118 e	19 . 27 g, 64 d, 109 i,	3, 3 72 o, 164 d
32 72 l	166 a	5 128 c
14, 2 106 p, 151 e	20 159 g	11 100 i
16 69 m, 114 s	24 124 n	13 125 d, N.
17 5 n	25 10 h, 67 g	21 126 k
21 167 b	24, 1 123 c	4, 1 44 d, 69 s
24 119 gg	3 90 m, 96	8 128 p
27 72 ee	4 116 k	10 115 d, 165 b
31 76 h	5 148 b	15 52 o
33 91 l	6 75 x	20 74 l
34 123 d	7 54 c, 93 z	21 54 k
35 67 g	10 113 r	26 51 k
40 58 k	17 55 f	39 72 w
41 135 p	22 29 f	41 90 c
15, 15 161 c	24 93 y	5, 3 135 g
24 119 w	25, 12 . 5 n, 131 r, N. 1	6 15 p, 138 d
29 143 c	26, 62 54 l	9 60 b
31 51 k	27, 7 135 o	12 113 bb
16, 13 54 e	31, 28 134 d	19 120 d, N. 2
15 117 d	32, 6 150 m	23 126 s, 132 k
22 100 m, 150 m	14 69 h	24 32 g
29 . 159 c, N., 159 q	17 72 p	26 151 c
17, 6 72 w	20 . 159 c, N., 159 q	6, 3 118 g, 165 b
10 67 t, 72 dd	30 68 i	7 119 l
17 139 c	32 32 d	11 96
20 72 ee	42 103 g	7, 5 52 n
25 128 v	34, 2 131 f	15 60 d
27 106 n	7 75 bb, N.	16 72 r, 109 d
28 . 67 e, 67 dd, 150 g,	14 23 c	24 53 l
N. 1		8, 3 44 e
18, 18 143 e	Deuteronomy	15 127 i
19, 12 74 b	1, 1 101 a	16 44 e
20, 3 65 a, 154 b	2 118 g, 134 f	19 106 i
5 59 a, 152 a, N.	3 53 g, 134 o	9, 8 54 k
18 152 w	5 120 g, 120 h	10, 5 29 g
21, 1 75 q	7 119 s	17 126 v, 133 i
5 59 a	13 119 s	19 112 aa
14 127 f	16 75 t, 112 u	11, 2 117 l
17 63 l	17 . 47 m, 53 r, 133 c	16 49 m
20 112 ss	18 117 gg	12, 3 52 n
23 157 b, N. 1	19 118 h, 126 v	13, 1 109 d
27 54 c, 75 hh	21 69 f	3 60 b
30 76 f	23 134 f	9 109 d
35 164 d	27 115 c, 115 f	14, 17 80 k
22, 1 125 h	28 124 q	15, 2 113 gg
6 . 20 d, 53 u, 67 o,	34 65 e, 149 b	7 . 119 w, N. 2, 139 d
120 c, 138 e	41 135 n	14 93 k
13 69 x, 115 c	44 . 67 g, 67 y, 107 g	16, 6 119 g
17 67 o	46 138 d	13 93 m
21 103 c	2, 9 75 bb, 118 g	20 133 h
23 117 e	13 119 s	17, 2 167 b
29 151 e, N. 2	14 134 h	5 124 o

Deuteronomy

17, 6144 e
8102 h
1444 d, 49 m
17109 g
18, 168 c, 131 h
1375 u
16109 d
20, 261 d
8121 b
14128 h
21, 3145 q
744 m
855 k
9117 d
10135 p
1149 m, 96
13101 a
22, 1159 gg
917 c
19109 d, 127 e
23131 b
23, 5130 c, N. 2
1120 h
1593 ss, 128 p
2596
24, 1167 b
454 h
851 n
1023 d
1358 i
23115 k
25, 296, 128 v
1267 ee
13123 f
26, 5119 i
1253 k
27, 6117 h h
916 b
28, 2458 f
36131 d
43133 k
4853 l
49155 d
5267 v
56113 d, 142 f, N. 2
5774 i
5991 n
62119 i
6675 rr
67151 b
29, 15157 c
1869 h, N. 2
21167 b
285 n
30, 492 b
31, 12120 e
1693 gg
2974 g
32, 12 s, 91 l, 117 b
369 o

Deuteronomy

32, 4126 c
513 c, 152 e
620 g, 75 ll, 100 i, 152 a, N.
760 f, 87 n, 123 c
853 k, 67 g, 109 h
1058 i, 58 k
1152 m, 155 g
1520 g, 144 p
17144 p, 152 a, N., 155 c, 155 f, 155 k
1875 s, 109 k
20108 a, 167 b
21152 a, N.
2269 f
2369 f
24116 h, 116 l
2658 a, N. 3, 75 mm
27159 y
2850 e, 93 q q
29159 x
30134 s
31156 b, N. 2
3220 h
3552 o, 145 o, 155 l
3629 v, 44 f, 152 s
3729 f, 75 u
39141 h, N. 2
4093 aa, N.
41159 n
46117 gg, 165 b
50110 c
33, 3116 s
4131 s
919 c, 117 b, N. 2
11116 i, 117 ll, 165 b
1244 c
1648 d, 90 l
19130 e, 133 k
2168 h, 76 d
2348 i, 69 f
24119 w
2691 l
27131 s
34, 9116 f

Joshua

1, 149 b, N. 2
2131 n
5106 c
7107 p, 135 o, N. 2
891 k
12125 b
2, 460 d, 135 p
5114 k
659 g
10117 c, 157 c
1363 q, 96
15126 r
1663 c, 72 q, 74 k

Joshua

2, 1734 a, N. 2, 59 h
1859 h
3, 554 k
7115 c
966 c
11128 c
12134 q
14127 g
16120 g
4, 372 s
4134 k
647 m
79 v
1452 l
2474 g
5, 2120 g, 124 q
863 q
6, 13112 i, 113 t
1775 oo
7, 763 p, 120 e, 154 a, N.
975 h h
21127 g, 134 g
25117 ee
8, 11127 g
2820 g
33127 i
9, 2118 q
8137 a
1254 f, 72 m, 126 aa
20113 dd
2475 h h
10, 13107 c, 135 p, 150 e
1793 oo
2423 i, 138 i
3690 e
11, 1453 l
12, 92 s
13, 7125 d
14145 u, N. 2
14, 164 d
772 aa
875 ii
11161 c
15, 3112 ss
590 d
1290 f
14134 l
1816 f
19117 x, 117 ff
2190 e
3621 e
3821 e, N. 2
16, 2112 ss
17, 1197 c, 117 l
18, 1290 i, 112 ss
2047 f
19, 11112 ss
1390 i
21, 1191 k

Joshua

22, 9 68 *i*
 17 117 *aa*
 20 150 *m*
 25 103 *a*, N. 1
 28, 5 60 *a*
 15 103 *b*
 24, 14 75 *oo*
 19 124 *h*, 145 *i*

Judges

1, 1 49 *b*, N. 2
 2 106 *m*
 3 49 *h*
 6 93 *r*
 7 . 116 *h*, 121 *d*, 141 *i*,
 156 *b*
 12 112 *ii*
 15 59 *h*
 19 114 *l*
 22 145 *c*
 28 113 *n*
 2, 1 107 *b*
 2 64 *i*
 18 112 *hh*
 19 112 *e*, 112 *ee*
 3, 23 112 *tt*
 24 67 *v*
 28 129 *e*
 4, 7 136 *b*
 8 49 *m*
 18 72 *s*, 72 *t*, 126 *r*
 19 74 *k*
 20 . 58 *g*, 64 *f*, 110 *k*,
 150 *n*, 152 *k*
 21 72 *p*, 72 *t*
 5, 1 2 *s*, 117 *b*, 146 *g*
 4 117 *s*
 5 67 *dd*, 136 *d*, N.
 7 20 *i*, 36, 44 *h*
 8 149 *e*
 10 87 *e*, 130 *a*
 12 10 *g*, 72 *s*
 13 69 *g*
 14 93 *aa*
 15 10 *g*, 87 *g*, 93 *bb*
 17 117 *bb*
 21 118 *q*
 22 20 *h*, 123 *e*
 24 119 *w*
 26 47 *k*
 27 154 *a*, N.
 28 64 *h*
 29 . 75 *w*, 128 *i*, 133 *h*
 6, 9 49 *c*, 49 *e*
 11 127 *d*
 13 159 *dd*
 14 126 *ee*
 16 49 *l*
 17 36
 18 114 *g*, 135 *a*

Judges

6, 19 53 *n*, 156 *d*
 20 34 *f*
 25 126 *w*, 128 *c*
 28 63 *p*
 31 73 *e*, 100 *m*
 36 116 *q*, 159 *v*
 7, 3 137 *c*
 6 93 *n*
 8 131 *s*
 12 36
 13 112 *qq*
 19 113 *s*
 20 147 *c*
 23 102 *b*
 25 124 *r*
 8, 1 . 74 *h*, 155 *d*, 155 *h*
 2 20 *m*
 4 118 *n*
 10 97 *e*
 11 130 *a*, N. 2
 19 63 *q*, 159 *x*
 28 117 *ii*
 32 125 *h*, 128 *c*
 9, 8 113 *o*
 9 . 63 *k*, 100 *n*, 106 *n*
 10 46 *d*, 46 *e*
 16 167 *a*
 17 119 *bb*
 28 137 *a*
 29 . 48 *l*, 76 *e*, 151 *b*,
 154 *b*
 39 69 *p*
 41 35 *d*
 45 117 *ee*
 48 157 *a*
 53 . 27 *o*, 67 *p*, 125 *b*
 55 145 *d*
 10, 4 96
 11 167 *b*
 11, 5 21 *b*
 10 159 *m*, N.
 18 47 *m*
 20 157 *b*, N. 1
 25 . 51 *i*, 133 *a*, N. 1
 29 118 *e*
 33 134 *e*
 34 . 135 *o*, 135 *o*, N. 2
 35 119 *i*
 39 144 *b*
 12, 5 100 *m*, 112 *cc*
 6 2 *t*
 7 124 *o*
 18, 2 125 *b*
 5 80 *d*
 6 . 44 *d*, 64 *f*, 127 *e*
 8 52 *s*
 12 135 *m*
 16 119 *m*
 21 75 *c*
 25 61 *c*

Judges

14, 2 90 *c*
 4 122 *q*, 135 *p*
 6 152 *p*
 8 133 *a*
 15 . 9 *v*, 150 *g*, N. 1
 17 134 *m*
 18 90 *f*, 93 *x*
 15, 1 119 *n*
 7 163 *c*, N.
 12 152 *w*
 13 113 *p*
 16, 5 66 *h*
 6 60 *d*
 9 126 *o*
 10 67 *dd*
 11 113 *o*
 13 28 *c*, N. 1
 14 127 *g*
 15 141 *e*
 16 10 *g*, 52 *d*
 18 112 *tt*
 20 123 *c*
 26 67 *v*
 27 126 *x*
 28 . 34 *a*, N. 2, 88 *f*,
 97 *b*, N.
 30 72 *r*
 17, 2 32 *h*
 18, 3 142 *e*
 19 20 *g*
 23 67 *g*, 67 *y*
 29 52 *q*
 30 5 *n*
 19, 5 . 9 *u*, 64 *c*, N. 1
 6 110 *h*, 120 *d*
 8 64 *c*
 9 91 *k*
 11 19 *i*
 12 123 *b*
 13 69 *x*, 73 *d*
 18 118 *e*, N. 3
 20 29 *g*, 73 *e*
 22 54 *c*
 20, 2 29 *f*
 15 54 *l*, 155 *d*
 16 90 *i*
 31 66 *f*
 32 20 *h*
 38 75 *gg*
 43 22 *s*
 44 117 *m*
 21, 9 54 *l*
 16 123 *b*
 17 155 *k*
 21 145 *p*

1 Samuel

1, 1 . 49 *b*, N. 2, 125 *b*,
 125 *h*, 156 *b*
 2 134 *l*, 145 *o*

1 Samuel

1, 3 112 *dd*
 4 112 *g*, 126 *s*
 6 . 20 *h*, 22 *s*, 59 *g*,
 113 *w*, 117 *p*
 7 107 *e*, 123 *c*
 8 37 *c*, 102 *l*
 9 . 91 *e*, 113 *e*, N. 1
 10 128 *y*
 11 113 *o*
 12 . . . 112 *ss*, 114 *n*
 13 20 *g*
 14 47 *o*
 16 128 *v*
 17 23 *f*, 95 *h*
 20 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 22 112 *oo*
 24 135 *i*
 25 148 *b*
 27 95 *h*
 28 64 *f*
 2, 1 . . . 25, 106 *g*, 117 *b*
 3 . 103 *g*, 120 *g*, 124 *e*,
 133 *k*, 152 *z*
 4 146 *a*
 6 111 *u*, 116 *x*
 8 . 107 *g*, 116 *x*, 135 *p*
 9 67 *g*, 142 *f*
 13 . 112 *oo*, 116 *w*, 131 *c*,
 159 *i*, 164 *a*
 14 131 *h*, 132 *g*
 15 112 *oo*
 16 . 23 *e*, 103 *g*, 106 *m*,
 112 *ll*, 113 *w*,
 159 *f*, 159 *dd*
 18 . 116 *k*, 118 *p*, *q*,
 121 *d*
 19 112 *e*
 20 145 *u*
 22 112 *k*
 23 126 *y*
 24 116 *s*
 26 113 *u*
 27 . 113 *g*, 114 *e*, 150 *e*
 28 . 49 *e*, 113 *z*, 119 *w*
 29 133 *b*
 30 113 *p*, 116 *g*
 31 112 *x*, 116 *d*
 33 . 53 *g*, 118 *g*, 145 *e*
 3, 2 107 *b*, 120 *b*
 3 107 *c*, 152 *r*
 5 . 46 *c*, 120 *g*, 120 *h*
 7 107 *c*
 10 . 54 *k*, 118 *u*, 123 *c*
 11 . 67 *g*, 67 *p*, 116 *w*,
 155 *d*
 12 113 *h*
 13 . 112 *qq*, 130 *c*, N. 2,
 119 *p*
 14 149 *c*
 17 149 *d*

1 Samuel

3, 21 75 *c*
 4, 1 131 *c*, 145 *c*
 3 127 *g*
 5 72 *h*, 145 *c*
 6 34 *f*
 7 125 *e*
 8 . 132 *h*, 136 *d*, 147 *d*
 10 124 *b*, 145 *o*
 12 127 *e*
 15 . 44 *m*, 145 *k*, 145 *n*
 16 126 *k*
 19 69 *m*, 112 *tt*
 21 152 *q*
 5, 3 116 *d*
 7 112 *rr*
 9 . 67 *v*, 130 *d*, 164 *d*
 10 115 *c*, 145 *m*
 11 117 *e*
 6, 4 118 *h*, 135 *r*
 7 135 *o*
 9 . 155 *d*, 155 *f*, 159 *q*
 10 60 *h*, 75 *qq*
 11 154 *a*, N.
 12 . 47 *k*, 71, 75 *n*,
 113 *s*
 14 127 *d*
 18 126 *x*
 19 119 *k*
 7, 7 138 *e*
 9 131 *b*
 10 116 *u*, 119 *c*
 14 72 *k*
 16 112 *f*
 17 29 *i*, N.
 20 111 *d*
 8, 11 72 *l*
 12 114 *p*
 19 20 *g*, 163 *a*
 9, 2 133 *a*
 3 . 96, 117 *d*, 152 *a*
 4 104 *g*, 152 *k*
 9 107 *e*
 10 120 *g*
 11 116 *u*
 13 35 *n*, 47 *m*
 17 138 *b*
 20 . 73 *e*, 134 *m*, 143 *c*
 21 133 *g*
 24 138 *i*, 138 *k*
 10, 3 97 *c*
 5 . 29 *g*, 101 *a*, 109 *k*,
 112 *z*
 6 75 *qq*
 8 112 *v*
 9 112 *uu*
 11 . 20 *h*, 111 *g*, 116 *s*,
 116 *w*, 136 *c*
 12 154 *b*
 13 75 *qq*
 14 152 *k*

1 Samuel

10, 16 113 *o*
 18 135 *a*
 23 133 *b*
 24 22 *s*, 100 *l*
 25 126 *s*
 27 136 *b*
 11, 1 125 *h*
 2 135 *p*
 5 107 *v*
 11 111 *g*
 12 150 *a*
 12, 3 137 *b*
 7 51 *p*
 13 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 14 167 *a*
 17 114 *o*
 19 107 *p*
 20 135 *a*
 23 126 *x*, 135 *g*
 24 75 *oo*
 25 29 *o*, 113 *o*
 18, 3 2 *b*
 6 93 *w*
 7 119 *gg*
 8 69 *t*
 11 67 *dd*
 13 159 *dd*
 15 132 *g*
 17 . 126 *l*, 126 *s*, 134 *l*
 19 152 *w*
 20 118 *e*
 21 . 35 *n*, 96, 112 *dd*
 22 112 *ee*
 23 92 *g*
 14, 1 126 *s*
 13 72 *m*
 14 118 *s*, N. 1
 15 95 *g*
 16 129 *b*
 19 111 *h*
 21 2 *b*
 22 53 *n*
 24 76 *d*, 112 *w*
 27 72 *k*
 28 72 *t*
 29 126 *x*
 30 . 106 *p*, 113 *o*, 159 *x*
 33 . 23 *c*, 74 *i*, 75 *oo*
 34 96
 36 . 48 *g*, N. 2, 67 *dd*,
 109 *d*
 38 66 *c*
 39 149 *c*
 43 113 *p*
 44 149 *d*
 45 119 *w*, N. 2
 49 47 *b*
 52 112 *ll*
 15, 1 9 *v*
 2 106 *uu*

1 Samuel

15, 4 93 *x*
 5 68 *i*
 6 . 20 *g*, 22 *s*, 60 *f*,
 68 *h*, 154 *a*, N.
 9 . 67 *t*, 75 *y*, 72 *ff*,
 132 *d*, 135 *c*
 14 37 *f*, 154 *b*
 16 165 *a*
 20 157 *c*
 23 . 29 *g*, 53 *l*, 111 *h*,
 119 *x*
 32 118 *q*
 33 119 *w*
 18, 1 65 *h*, 127 *d*
 2 114 *g*, 159 *g*
 3 138 *e*
 4 . 141 *n*, 145 *u*, 150 *a*
 7 35 *g*, 132 *c*
 8 125 *i*
 11 133 *g*
 12 128 *x*
 14 112 *h*
 16 . 120 *b*, N. 1, 124 *i*
 18 128 *t*, 129 *c*
 20 128 *q*
 23 . 112 *ee*, 112 *oo*,
 126 *x*
 17, 5 121 *d*, 131 *q*
 12 113 *u*, 126 *x*
 14 133 *g*, 134 *l*
 15 118 *g*
 16 113 *h*
 17 126 *x*, 134 *n*
 20 112 *rr*
 21 122 *i*
 24 111 *h*
 25 . 22 *s*, 53 *n*, 60 *g*,
 100 *l*, 114 *g*, 116 *s*
 26 34 *f*, 132 *h*
 28 136 *c*
 32 112 *p*
 34 . 112 *kk*, 126 *r*,
 154 *a*, N.
 38 112 *tt*
 40 132 *c*
 41 113 *u*
 43 124 *o*
 46 145 *e*
 47 53 *p*, 145 *c*
 48 112 *uu*
 55 . 111 *k*, 126 *aa*,
 136 *c*, 137 *b*
 58 126 *e*, 126 *f*
 18, 1 60 *d*
 9 55 *c*
 10 54 *e*, 118 *u*
 14 156 *e*
 15 157 *c*
 18 137 *a*
 19 . 114 *g*, 115 *e*, N.

1 Samuel

18, 21 134 *r*
 22 59 *c*
 23 114 *a*
 28 59 *g*, 59 *i*
 29 68 *h*, 69 *n*
 19, 1 115 *a*
 2 51 *n*, 63 *c*
 3 119 *l*
 4 93 *ss*
 10 126 *y*
 13 . 124 *h*, 132 *h*, N. 2
 17 59 *h*, 150 *e*
 22 126 *x*
 23 113 *t*, 135 *g*
 20, 1 116 *s*
 2 103 *g*, 156 *f*
 3 . 118 *x*, 126 *x*,
 149 *a*, N.
 6 . 51 *e*, 51 *i*, 113 *n*,
 159 *s*
 8 142 *g*
 9 150 *a*
 10 150 *i*, 151 *a*
 11 118 *z*
 13 . 117 *l*, N. 2, 149 *d*
 16 117 *g*
 19 120 *c*
 20 127 *e*
 23 143 *a*
 26 152 *d*
 27 80 *g*, N. 1
 31 128 *v*, 138 *d*
 33 115 *c*
 38 87 *f*
 40 72 *y*
 42 134 *d*, 135 *f*
 21, 2 . 90 *t*, 119 *gg*, 152 *o*
 3 55 *b*, 137 *c*
 5 119 *e*, N. 2
 6 123 *b*
 8 129 *h*
 9 150 *c*, N. 2
 10 102 *g*
 14 . 60 *d*, 75 *bb*, 131 *m*,
 N. 3
 16 150 *b*
 22, 2 75 *oo*
 5 119 *s*
 7 . 117 *n*, 124 *p*, 153
 9 90 *i*
 13 113 *e*
 15 67 *w*, 150 *b*
 22, 1 93 *r*
 4 152 *u*
 10 113 *o*, 117 *n*
 11 . 150 *g*, N. 1, 150 *n*
 15 90 *e*
 19 150 *e*
 22 . 63 *n*, 135 *b*, 144 *d*,
 N. 2

1 Samuel

23, 28 22 *s*
 24, 6 117 *d*
 11 . 9 *v*, 112 *rr*, 144 *o*,
 157 *c*
 12 . 114 *r*, 154 *a*, N.
 18 117 *ff*
 19 . 112 *hh*, N. 2, 117 *c*
 25, 1 21 *d*
 2 67 *cc*
 5 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 7 53 *p*
 8 . 72 *o*, 74 *h*, 76 *g*
 10 67 *ee*, 126 *w*
 11 112 *cc*
 14 72 *ff*
 15 130 *d*
 18 24 *b*, 75 *v*
 20 47 *h*, 112 *ss*
 22 149 *b*
 24 135 *g*
 25 107 *p*
 26 . 65 *f*, 113 *e*, 113
 88, 144 *l*, N. 3,
 149 *a*, N.
 27 . 143 *d*, 145 *a*, 145 *o*,
 N. 1
 28 119 *w*, N. 2
 29 143 *c*
 33 75 *qq*
 34 . 76 *h*, 106 *p*, 149 *d*
 39 114 *p*
 28, 9 112 *h*
 10 117 *m*, N. 3
 12 87 *s*, 152 *l*
 13 156 *c*
 14 155 *m*
 16 117 *l*
 19 72 *aa*
 20 117 *d*
 27, 9 112 *e*, 112 *dd*
 10 150 *a*, N. 1
 28, 3 . 106 *f*, 154 *a*, N.
 6 149 *c*
 7 . 52 *d*, 96, 128 *n*,
 130 *e*
 8 10 *h*, 46 *e*
 10 20 *h*
 13 132 *h*, N. 2
 15 . 48 *d*, 59 *f*, 75 *ll*,
 102 *l*
 24 68 *h*
 29, 8 49 *m*, 130 *c*
 10 144 *c*
 30, 2 156 *f*
 6 144 *b*
 8 . 150 *b*, 154 *a*, N.
 13 134 *o*, N. 1
 24 161 *c*
 26 91 *h*
 28 10 *g*

1 Samuel

31, 2 53ⁿ
7 103^g
9 124^r

2 Samuel

1, 4 157^c
6 75^{rr}, 113^o
9 72^m, 128^e
10 61^b, 107^b
18 150^e
21 130^a, 152^g
23 44^c, 154^a, N. 2
24 116^f
26 75^{oo}
2, 5 121^f
9 49^l
20 136^d
21 64^c, 119^s
22 102^l, 150^e
23 111^g, 116^w
26 44^g
27 159^{ee}
32 72^r, 118^e
3, 1 113^u, 145^c
2 129^g
8 75^{qq}, 111^e
11 115^d
18 113^{dd}, N. 3
25 117^h
27 117^{ll}
30 117ⁿ
33 107^t
34 152^d, 152^e
39 141^e
4, 1 145^p
2 128^c
4 128^h
7 141^e
10 111^h, 114^l, N. 2
11 117^d
5, 2 74^k
6 35^g, 106^m
8 167^a
10 125^h
21 146^f
24 109^k, 112^s, 117^d
6, 1 68^h
2 125^c
3 126^s
6 117^g
16 112^{uu}
20 75^y, 148^b
7, 5 112^r, 150^d
14 112^{mm}
29 120^d
8, 2 126^m
3 17^b
4 69^v
8 131^e

2 Samuel

9, 1 165^a
3 152^s, 128^y
10, 7 131^b
9 145^h, 146^a
12 54^k
11, 1 23^g
4 141^e
11 149^a, N. 2
19 142^f, N. 2
20 157^c
24 75^{rr}
25 117^l
27 60^d
12, 1 72^p
2 126^d, 126^x, 146^f
6 97^h
9 144ⁿ
10 114^g
14 52^o
15 51^m
16 112^f, 117^q
17 75^{rr}
28 61^f, 135^a
30 127^e
18, 4 p. 481, N. 1
5 75^{cc}
12 75^{hh}
15 117^q
17 64^c, 117^d
18 47^l, 112^{ll}, N. 2,
156^b
19 113^t
20 84^a s, 118^p,
154^a, N. 2
23 131^d
25 152^g, 165^a
26 159^{dd}
28 72^w, 159^g
31 116^k
32 73^f
39 131^g, 144^o
14, 2 75^m
3 76^g
4 126^e
6 60^d
10 145^u
11 75^{ff}
13 92^b
19 47^b, N. 1
21 106^m
24 75ⁿ
26 118^h, 134^g
30 71ⁱ
31 102^l
15, 2 111^g
4 112^p, 151^a
16 117^d
21 93^{aa}, N., 130^c
23 117^t
25 117^e, 135^k

2 Samuel

15, 27 72^s
32 116^k, 121^d
33 49^l, 75^w
34 67^{dd}, 143^d
37 93^{ll}
16, 1 134ⁿ
5 112^{ll}, 113^t
7 128^t
13 93^{gg}, 112^f
17, 5 135^f
8 117^h
9 144^e
10 67^t
11 106ⁱ
12 109^d, 122^l
13 106^o
15 135^a
16 121^a
17 112^h, 126^r
22 96, 130^g
23 51^m
26 118^g
18, 3 63ⁱ, 97^g
11 114^l, 119^{aa}, 154^b
12 137^c, 154^b
13 159^{cc}
16 22^s
18 117^d
19 119^{ff}
22 74ⁱ
23 110^b
29 114^f, 150^a
33 133^l, N. 3
19, 1 135^f, 151^b
6 70^c
13 112ⁱ
14 68^h
18 97^e, 112^{ll}
19 53^q
20 115^g
25 52^l, 127^f
27 122^f
30 106ⁱ
43 76^b
44 67^w
20, 1 116^d, 147^c
5 68^c
8 142^e
9 68^h, 141^c
11 155^e
13 69^w
14 125^h
18 113^w
19 130^f, N. 2
20 149^a, 149^e
21 53^s
23 16^b, 127^f
21, 2 74^h
3 110ⁱ
4 120^c

2 Samuel

21, 9	118 <i>i</i>
11	121 <i>a</i>
12	75 <i>rr</i>
15	72 <i>t</i>
20	35 <i>m</i> , 131 <i>q</i>
22	121 <i>b</i>
22, 1	25, 53 <i>l</i> , 130 <i>d</i>
24	49 <i>e</i>
27	67 <i>l</i>
33	35 <i>d</i> , 131 <i>r</i>
37	103 <i>d</i>
38	108 <i>e</i>
40	68 <i>k</i>
41	19 <i>i</i> , 116 <i>w</i>
44	87 <i>f</i>
23, 1	25, 29 <i>g</i>
5	135 <i>m</i> , 150 <i>a</i>
6	91 <i>f</i> , 143 <i>a</i>
7	113 <i>w</i>
8	47 <i>b</i> , 87 <i>f</i>
11	127 <i>e</i>
13	134 <i>k</i>
17	167 <i>a</i>
19	150 <i>d</i>
24, 3	145 <i>n</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
6	90 <i>i</i>
11	93 <i>rr</i>
13	145 <i>k</i>
16	142 <i>f</i>
21	105 <i>a</i>
22	93 <i>pp</i>
23	106 <i>m</i>
24	113 <i>p</i>

1 Kings

1, 1	49 <i>b</i> , 67 <i>g</i>
2	131 <i>b</i> , 144 <i>f</i>
5	116 <i>o</i>
6	119 <i>w</i> , N. 2
12	117 <i>p</i>
14	116 <i>u</i>
15	80 <i>d</i> , 90 <i>c</i>
20	135 <i>g</i>
21	146 <i>d</i> , 154 <i>a</i> , N.
24	150 <i>a</i> , 150 <i>b</i>
26	135 <i>g</i>
27	150 <i>f</i>
31	156 <i>c</i>
40	117 <i>g</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
41	146 <i>a</i>
47	70 <i>c</i>
2, 2	116 <i>p</i>
3	95 <i>u</i> , 114 <i>o</i>
6	109 <i>d</i>
7	116 <i>k</i>
17	131 <i>g</i>
18	135 <i>a</i>
21	121 <i>b</i>
22	110 <i>a</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
23	149 <i>d</i>

1 Kings

2, 26	75 <i>z</i> , 118 <i>e</i> , 128 <i>t</i>
30	75 <i>ll</i>
31	128 <i>w</i>
36	80 <i>i</i> , 90 <i>i</i>
39	129 <i>c</i>
40	90 <i>i</i>
42	72 <i>aa</i>
43	128 <i>k</i>
8, 4	107 <i>b</i>
7	114 <i>c</i>
8	166 <i>b</i>
11	112 <i>tt</i>
12	166 <i>b</i>
15	71
16	107 <i>c</i>
18	129 <i>f</i> , 135 <i>r</i>
26	46 <i>e</i>
4, 5	93 <i>ll</i>
7	112 <i>l</i>
12	90 <i>i</i>
13	128 <i>c</i>
14	90 <i>d</i>
16	116 <i>p</i>
5, 1	116 <i>s</i> , 144 <i>i</i>
2	68 <i>c</i>
3	131 <i>c</i>
7	112 <i>dd</i>
9	131 <i>e</i>
12	134 <i>g</i>
17	117 <i>h</i>
25	23 <i>f</i> , 107 <i>e</i>
29	131 <i>b</i>
6, 1	134 <i>k</i> , 134 <i>o</i>
6	63 <i>i</i>
7	131 <i>c</i>
11	67 <i>x</i>
16	117 <i>d</i>
19	66 <i>i</i>
7, 6	92 <i>g</i>
7	118 <i>p</i> , 126 <i>w</i>
8	118 <i>g</i>
14	41 <i>o</i> , 131 <i>b</i>
15	117 <i>kk</i>
27	134 <i>l</i>
28	20 <i>m</i>
37	91 <i>f</i>
8, 1	109 <i>k</i>
3	119 <i>z</i>
5	145 <i>c</i>
13	118 <i>k</i>
29	91 <i>k</i>
30	119 <i>g</i> , 159 <i>g</i>
31	145 <i>o</i>
33	158 <i>d</i>
44	75 <i>w</i>
48	44 <i>i</i>
64	133 <i>c</i>
9, 3	75 <i>w</i>
8	67 <i>g</i>
11	75 <i>oo</i>

1 Kings

9, 25	116 <i>f</i>
25	112 <i>dd</i> , 113 <i>s</i>
26	122 <i>t</i>
10, 8	126 <i>z</i> , N. 1
11	35 <i>m</i>
15	128 <i>m</i>
22	74 <i>i</i>
23	119 <i>n</i> , 152 <i>y</i>
29	75 <i>t</i>
11, 1	10 <i>k</i>
3	145 <i>p</i>
5	122 <i>f</i>
8	131 <i>k</i> , N. 1
9	138 <i>k</i>
12	135 <i>p</i>
15	52 <i>f</i>
16	53 <i>l</i>
19	54 <i>k</i>
25	117 <i>m</i> , N. 3
30	117 <i>ii</i>
33	87 <i>e</i>
34	117 <i>ii</i>
39	23 <i>d</i>
41	150 <i>e</i>
12, 2	138 <i>d</i>
6	64 <i>b</i> , 117 <i>gg</i>
8	116 <i>q</i> , 118 <i>q</i>
10	93 <i>q</i>
12	74 <i>k</i>
15	115 <i>a</i>
28	133 <i>c</i>
31	117 <i>d</i>
32	21 <i>d</i> , 65 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>pp</i>
13, 2	155 <i>e</i>
3	112 <i>tt</i>
7	10 <i>k</i>
12	155 <i>d</i> , 155 <i>k</i>
18	156 <i>d</i>
30	147 <i>d</i>
33	109 <i>f</i>
14, 2	32 <i>k</i>
3	65 <i>g</i>
5	94 <i>d</i> , 112 <i>s</i>
6	118 <i>p</i> , 121 <i>d</i> , N. 2
10	64 <i>d</i>
12	72 <i>r</i> , N.
13	129 <i>g</i>
15	91 <i>m</i>
16	23 <i>c</i>
17	116 <i>m</i>
19	129 <i>d</i> , 150 <i>e</i>
21	10 <i>g</i>
24	127 <i>g</i>
15, 13	119 <i>x</i>
23	118 <i>q</i>
25	134 <i>p</i>
18, 2	74 <i>l</i>
10	134 <i>o</i>
24	29 <i>f</i> , 88 <i>b</i>
31	150 <i>d</i>

1 Kings

17, 193 <i>pp</i>
3119 <i>s</i>
990 <i>i</i>
1166 <i>g</i>
1375 <i>m</i>
1466 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>r</i>
1532 <i>l</i>
16146 <i>a</i>
18, 5119 <i>w</i> , N. 2
10107 <i>e</i>
12138 <i>e</i>
2753 <i>q</i> , 67 <i>y</i>
32117 <i>ii</i> , 117 <i>kk</i>
43152 <i>p</i>
4458 <i>g</i>
18, 4157 <i>c</i>
11132 <i>d</i>
1526 <i>h</i> , 90 <i>c</i> , 90 <i>i</i>
19134 <i>o</i>
2020 <i>m</i>
21131 <i>m</i>
20, 14137 <i>b</i>
20145 <i>c</i>
21112 <i>tt</i>
2254 <i>h</i>
25103 <i>b</i>
2754 <i>l</i>
3353 <i>n</i>
3575 <i>mm</i>
3951 <i>h</i>
40116 <i>g</i>
21, 234 <i>c</i>
8124 <i>b</i> , N.
10104 <i>g</i>
11116 <i>q</i> , 118 <i>q</i>
12112 <i>qq</i> , 112 <i>tt</i>
1569 <i>f</i>
1974 <i>h</i> , 135 <i>f</i>
2174 <i>h</i> , 74 <i>l</i>
2572 <i>w</i>
22, 3150 <i>e</i>
7103 <i>b</i>
10121 <i>d</i>
12110 <i>f</i>
15150 <i>c</i>
16134 <i>r</i>
23126 <i>y</i>
2575 <i>pp</i>
27131 <i>c</i>
28135 <i>r</i> , 159 <i>q</i>
30104 <i>g</i> , 113 <i>dd</i>
3571
4944 <i>m</i>

2 Kings

1, 149 <i>b</i>
2126 <i>y</i>
3152 <i>y</i>
737 <i>f</i>
10154 <i>b</i>

2 Kings

1, 11120 <i>d</i>
2, 110 <i>h</i> , 114 <i>q</i>
1052 <i>s</i> , 114 <i>n</i> , N. 3
1693 <i>u</i> , 107 <i>q</i> , N. 3
2175 <i>oo</i>
2275 <i>qq</i>
24122 <i>e</i>
3, 3135 <i>p</i>
42 <i>d</i> , 112 <i>h</i> , 131 <i>k</i>
8155 <i>d</i>
15112 <i>uu</i>
16113 <i>bb</i> , 123 <i>e</i>
23113 <i>w</i>
2475 <i>ff</i>
25112 <i>e</i>
27107 <i>k</i>
4, 1125 <i>b</i>
391 <i>l</i> , 133 <i>c</i> , N. 1
8126 <i>s</i>
13114 <i>h</i> , 117 <i>r</i>
14154 <i>b</i>
1632 <i>h</i>
2466 <i>c</i>
2534 <i>f</i>
2763 <i>e</i>
3129 <i>h</i>
4169 <i>f</i>
43113 <i>ee</i>
5, 2118 <i>q</i>
3151 <i>e</i>
9129 <i>d</i>
10110 <i>i</i> , 113 <i>bb</i> , 159 <i>d</i>
11112 <i>p</i>
12107 <i>t</i>
13110 <i>f</i> , 142 <i>f</i> , 159 <i>cc</i>
17104 <i>g</i> , 159 <i>dd</i>
1875 <i>kk</i>
20106 <i>n</i> , N. 2, 112 <i>gg</i>
22136 <i>d</i>
2372 <i>t</i> , 88 <i>b</i> , 131 <i>d</i>
6, 5117 <i>m</i> , N. 3
891 <i>n</i>
951 <i>n</i>
10134 <i>r</i>
1136
1934 <i>b</i> , N. 1, 52 <i>n</i>
22	p. 481, N. 1
27109 <i>h</i>
2974 <i>l</i>
3222 <i>s</i> , 100 <i>l</i>
7, 1131 <i>d</i>
4112 <i>ff</i>
847 <i>i</i>
10135 <i>p</i> , N. 3
13127 <i>f</i>
1810 <i>h</i>
8, 132 <i>h</i>
653 <i>m</i> , 72 <i>y</i> , 91 <i>e</i>
8126 <i>y</i>
1652 <i>l</i>

2 Kings

8, 17134 <i>e</i>
2150 <i>e</i>
9, 272 <i>w</i> , 76 <i>h</i>
4127 <i>g</i>
1780 <i>f</i>
1832 <i>n</i> , 103 <i>o</i> , 119 <i>b</i>
27147 <i>c</i>
3376 <i>c</i>
3775 <i>m</i>
10, 1124 <i>b</i> , N.
6131 <i>h</i> , N. 1
15159 <i>cc</i>
21102 <i>h</i>
23152 <i>w</i>
2993 <i>o</i>
11, 1112 <i>pp</i>
2116 <i>e</i>
475 <i>gg</i> , 75 <i>q</i> , 97 <i>g</i>
5116 <i>h</i>
1274 <i>l</i>
1387 <i>e</i>
15113 <i>cc</i> , 119 <i>e</i>
12, 972 <i>h</i> , 66 <i>g</i> , 93 <i>h</i>
12	p. 354, N. 1
18, 674 <i>h</i>
11125 <i>b</i>
1776 <i>f</i>
19114 <i>k</i> , 159 <i>dd</i>
21111 <i>g</i>
14, 721 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>tt</i>
8156 <i>c</i>
14112 <i>pp</i> , 112 <i>tt</i> , 124 <i>q</i>
15, 1676 <i>c</i> , 127 <i>i</i>
2980 <i>k</i>
16, 465 <i>e</i>
772 <i>p</i>
14127 <i>h</i>
17127 <i>h</i>
1880 <i>k</i>
17, 4118 <i>u</i>
6134 <i>p</i>
1153 <i>p</i>
15103 <i>l</i>
29124 <i>r</i>
18, 1134 <i>p</i>
4112 <i>tt</i>
17128 <i>w</i> , N.
2044 <i>i</i>
262 <i>a</i>
282 <i>a</i>
2974 <i>l</i>
30121 <i>b</i> , N. 2
19, 2131 <i>h</i> , N. 1
14124 <i>b</i> , N.
2172 <i>l</i>
2523 <i>f</i> , 75 <i>qq</i>
20, 149 <i>a</i>
13126 <i>x</i>
19141 <i>n</i>

2 Kings

21, 11	74 <i>l</i>
12	67 <i>g</i>
13	113 <i>h</i> , N. 3
26	144 <i>d</i> , N. 2
22, 1	134 <i>e</i>
13	138 <i>b</i>
20	61 <i>h</i> , 124 <i>c</i>
23, 3	127 <i>c</i>
4	75 <i>v</i> , 112 <i>pp</i> , p. 354, N. 1
8	p. 354, N. 1
10	112 <i>pp</i> , 114 <i>s</i>
14	p. 354, N. 1
15	67 <i>v</i>
17	127 <i>f</i> , 127 <i>g</i>
20	117 <i>d</i>
35	139 <i>c</i>
24, 7	144 <i>b</i>
14	97 <i>g</i>
25, 9	117 <i>d</i>
15	123 <i>e</i>
16	126 <i>s</i>
17	134 <i>e</i>
18	131 <i>b</i>
28	122 <i>g</i>
29	75 <i>rr</i>

Isaiah

1, 2	116 <i>n</i> , 126 <i>e</i>
3	124 <i>i</i>
4	147 <i>d</i>
5	37 <i>e</i> , 127 <i>c</i>
6	67 <i>m</i> , 144 <i>b</i> , 152 <i>o</i>
7	116 <i>l</i> , 118 <i>x</i> , 143 <i>a</i>
9	106 <i>p</i> , 118 <i>x</i>
11	106 <i>g</i> , 117 <i>s</i>
12	51 <i>l</i> , 106 <i>g</i>
14	66 <i>b</i> , 76 <i>b</i> , 102 <i>h</i> , 114 <i>c</i> , 119 <i>aa</i>
15	60 <i>f</i> , 61 <i>e</i> , 117 <i>s</i> , 124 <i>n</i> , 145 <i>n</i>
16	54 <i>d</i> , 128 <i>r</i>
17	113 <i>d</i> , 117 <i>u</i>
18	126 <i>o</i> , 160 <i>a</i>
19	120 <i>e</i>
20	52 <i>e</i> , 121 <i>c</i>
21	90 <i>l</i> , 95 <i>h</i> , 107 <i>b</i> , 148 <i>b</i>
22	126 <i>m</i>
23	107 <i>g</i> , 124 <i>f</i>
24	51 <i>p</i>
25	118 <i>w</i> , 124 <i>l</i>
26	118 <i>s</i> , N. 1, 135 <i>m</i>
27	116 <i>h</i>
28	147 <i>c</i>
29	144 <i>p</i>
30	91 <i>d</i> , 116 <i>i</i> , 152 <i>o</i>
31	93 <i>q</i>
2, 1	154 <i>a</i> , N.
2	116 <i>r</i>

Isaiah

2, 6	44 <i>g</i> , 91 <i>n</i>
7	117 <i>s</i>
8	145 <i>m</i>
9	109 <i>e</i> , 117 <i>g</i>
11	112 <i>s</i> , 146 <i>a</i>
17	145 <i>o</i>
18	15 <i>f</i>
20	84 <i>bm</i> , 135 <i>n</i> , 145 <i>m</i>
22	116 <i>e</i> , 119 <i>s</i>
3, 1	116 <i>p</i> , 122 <i>v</i>
3	116 <i>k</i>
6	103 <i>g</i> , 118 <i>g</i>
7	117 <i>g</i> , 117 <i>ii</i> , 156 <i>b</i>
8	53 <i>q</i> , 122 <i>i</i>
9	135 <i>i</i> , 156 <i>g</i>
12	124 <i>k</i> , 145 <i>l</i>
13	115 <i>b</i>
14	128 <i>h</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
15	37 <i>c</i>
16	52 <i>n</i> , 75 <i>v</i> , 111 <i>r</i> , 112 <i>nn</i> , 113 <i>u</i> , 135 <i>o</i>
17	91 <i>c</i> , 91 <i>f</i> , 141 <i>f</i>
22	35 <i>f</i>
24	131 <i>b</i>
4, 4	106 <i>e</i> , 107 <i>l</i> , 113 <i>e</i> , 159 <i>n</i> , N.
5, 1	87 <i>f</i> , N., 108 <i>b</i> , 128 <i>v</i>
2	114 <i>m</i> , 117 <i>u</i>
3	110 <i>a</i>
4	114 <i>k</i> , 150 <i>m</i>
5	112 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>d</i> , 113 <i>f</i> , 114 <i>k</i> , N. 1, 116 <i>d</i> , 116 <i>p</i>
6	117 <i>s</i> , 117 <i>ii</i> , 119 <i>y</i>
8	112 <i>w</i> , 116 <i>x</i> , 144 <i>p</i> , 147 <i>d</i>
9	152 <i>y</i>
10	93 <i>m</i>
11	112 <i>m</i> , 130 <i>a</i> , 156 <i>d</i> , 156 <i>e</i>
12	93 <i>ss</i> , 106 <i>l</i> , 141 <i>d</i>
13	106 <i>n</i> , 128 <i>l</i>
14	20 <i>f</i> , 112 <i>s</i>
15	111 <i>w</i>
17	118 <i>t</i> , 142 <i>f</i>
19	48 <i>d</i> , 108 <i>d</i>
23	116 <i>x</i> , 145 <i>m</i>
24	114 <i>r</i> , 115 <i>h</i>
25	136 <i>b</i>
26	133 <i>h</i> , N. 2, 145 <i>m</i>
28	20 <i>h</i>
29	152 <i>l</i>
30	136 <i>b</i>
6, 1	111 <i>b</i>
2	88 <i>f</i> , 119 <i>cc</i> , 134 <i>q</i>
3	112 <i>k</i> , 133 <i>h</i> , 139 <i>e</i> , N. 3, 141 <i>l</i>
4	107 <i>b</i> , 107 <i>d</i> , 117 <i>s</i>
5	106 <i>n</i> , 128 <i>y</i> , 147 <i>d</i>

Isaiah

6, 6	94 <i>b</i> , 155 <i>k</i> , 156 <i>b</i>
7	112 <i>x</i>
8	61 <i>g</i> , 117 <i>c</i> , 124 <i>g</i> , N. 2, 137 <i>b</i>
9	75 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>r</i>
10	67 <i>v</i> , 136 <i>b</i>
11	106 <i>o</i> , 144 <i>d</i> , 152 <i>y</i>
12	67 <i>k</i>
13	52 <i>p</i> , 112 <i>mm</i> , 114 <i>k</i> , N. 1, 120 <i>d</i>
7, 2	72 <i>q</i> , 122 <i>i</i>
3	95 <i>s</i>
4	113 <i>bb</i>
6	122 <i>i</i>
7	122 <i>g</i> , 144 <i>b</i>
8	119 <i>y</i>
9	148 <i>d</i> , 159 <i>cc</i>
11	29 <i>n</i>
13	114 <i>e</i> , 133 <i>c</i>
14	74 <i>g</i> , 112 <i>l</i> , 113 <i>h</i> , 126 <i>r</i> , p. 459, N. 1, 135 <i>c</i>
15	113 <i>f</i>
17	49 <i>a</i>
20	126 <i>x</i>
23	134 <i>n</i>
25	118 <i>l</i> , 144 <i>k</i>
8, 1	29 <i>l</i> , 52 <i>s</i> , 119 <i>n</i>
2	49 <i>e</i> , 96
4	144 <i>d</i>
6	2 <i>d</i> , N. 2, 130 <i>a</i>
7	154 <i>b</i>
8	145 <i>o</i>
9	110 <i>f</i>
11	45 <i>d</i> , 59 <i>h</i>
12	47 <i>m</i> , 117 <i>r</i>
16	67 <i>n</i>
17	75 <i>s</i>
20	145 <i>m</i>
21	54 <i>k</i> , 118 <i>n</i>
23	67 <i>v</i> , 90 <i>f</i> , 128 <i>h</i>
9, 1	106 <i>n</i> , 130 <i>a</i> , 132 <i>g</i>
2	103 <i>g</i> , 130 <i>a</i>
3	10 <i>h</i> , 20 <i>h</i> , 67 <i>w</i> , 93 <i>q</i> , 118 <i>u</i> , 135 <i>n</i>
4	112 <i>mm</i> , 124 <i>n</i> , 143 <i>d</i> , 146 <i>e</i>
5	93 <i>k</i> , 144 <i>d</i>
6	5 <i>n</i>
8	127 <i>c</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
11	127 <i>c</i>
12	116 <i>f</i>
18	145 <i>o</i>
10, 1	10 <i>g</i> , 93 <i>bb</i>
2	114 <i>r</i>
4	163 <i>c</i>
5	152 <i>a</i>
9	21 <i>d</i>
10	133 <i>e</i>
12	47 <i>b</i> , 127 <i>a</i>

Isaiah

10, 13 . 23 d, 75 s, 107 b,
N. 1
14 . . . 118 w, 132 e
15 . 115 d, 124 h, 150 f
16 69 f
17 93 v
18 67 cc
22 117 s
24 . . . 58 i, 119 o
30 . . 132 b, 144 m
32 . . 114 h, 119 o
33 23 c
11, 2 128 a
7 122 e
8 142 f
9 . 106 m, 114 c, 115 d,
116 f, N. 1, 117 n,
126 s
10 119 gg
12 20 m
14 93 h k
12, 1 109 h
2 80 g
5 116 e
6 122 s
13, 3 135 n
4 . . 146 b, 147 c
6 118 x
8 119 gg
18 52 n
19 115 d
20 68 k
22 145 o
14, 2 . 54 f, 57, N. 3,
117 w
3 . 22 s, 102 b, 115 g,
121 b, 121 f
4 . 49 h, 49 m, 148 b
6 . . . 117 g, 130 a
7 116 x
9 145 t
11 . . 93 s, 145 o
14 87 s
17 117 o
19 . 29 f, 126 p, 130 a
23 . . 55 f, 113 e
24 . . 144 b, 149 b
27 . . 116 g, 126 k
30 72 w
31 . . 72 v, 113 b b
15, 2 . . . 70 d, 96
5 72 cc
7 155 h
8 119 h k
10 61 h
16, 2 126 p
4 145 d
7 70 d
8 . . . 75 m, 145 u
9 75 dd

Isaiah

16, 10 . . . 121 b, 144 e
17, 1 . . . 119 x, 121 b
4 128 r
5 . . . 117 ii, 122 n
6 . 118 m, 131 n, N. 1,
134 s
8 35 f
10 . 20 m, N. 1, 117 ee
11 72 n
12 . . . 47 m, 75 m
18, 2 . . . 52 s, 103 m
3 66 b
4 10 h
5 . 29 g, 67 v, 72 dd,
142 f, 145 g
6 73 b
19, 1 72 i
3 67 dd
4 . . 124 i, 132 h
6 . . . 53 g, 53 p
9 86 i
10 128 y
11 133 h
13 142 f
17 . 80 h, 95 d, 143 b
18 2 a
22 113 s
20, 1 115 k
2 . . . 113 i, 118 n
4 . . . 87 g, 118 o
21, 1 114 o
2 . 44 o, 72 s, 121 b
7 . . 93 dd, 117 q
8 118 r
9 136 d
11 . 90 f, 93 w, 116 t
12 . 29 t, 75 u, 75 rr
14 76 d
17 . 127 a, 128 a, 146 a
22, 1 . . . 91 e, 150 l
2 . 75 v, 91 e, 117 s,
126 e, 128 x, 152 d
3 119 w
5 . . 113 ff, 128 a
7 128 r
10 20 m
11 . . . 95 o, 124 k
13 . 75 n, 113 d, 113 f,
113 dd
14 . 112 s, 149 b, 149 e
16 . . 90 m, 144 p
17 113 r
18 118 r
19 144 p
24 . . 128 w, 133 h
29, 1 . . . 110 k, 119 y
4 152 s
5 . . 118 u, 128 h
7 126 s, N.
8 93 pp

Isaiah

28, 11 . . . 20 o, 53 g
12 . 35 b, 46 e, 118 e,
130 e, 132 b
13 136 d, N.
15 . 44 f, 116 p, 118 t
17 . . . 72 l, 93 e
24, 2 . 35 g, 116 s, 127 i
3 67 t
10 119 x
12 121 d
19 . 67 o, 80 k, 113 w
25, 6 . . . 75 dd, 93 ss
7 72 p
10 72 v
26, 4 119 i
9 144 m
10 159 c
11 47 m
16 . . . 44 l, 72 o
19 . . . 95 h, 122 s
20 75 gg
27, 3 60 a
4 . 10 h, 65 b, 71,
117 x, 151 b
5 162 a
8 55 f
9 156 f
11 . 70 a, N. 2, 124 e
26, 1 . . . 124 e, 128 c
2 125 c
3 47 h
4 . 91 e, 128 w, 135 n,
144 e
6 . . . 90 i, 119 h k
7 72 l
8 127 c
9 130 a
10 . . . 102 h, 147 c
11 116 b
12 . 23 t, 114 m, N. 2
16 . 71, 130 f, N. 1, 155 f
17 . . . 29 u, 142 f
18 145 o
20 133 c
21 . . . 118 t, 132 b
24 144 e
26 112 rr
27 152 s
28 . . . 112 m, 113 w
29, 1 . 19 c, 66 f, 69 h, N.,
130 d
4 120 g
5 . 126 p, 133 h, N. 2
6 . . . 84 a s, 144 b
7 . 75 gg, 116 s, 118 t
8 116 s
9 55 g, 72 l
13 . 115 d, 127 a, 142 d
14 . 50 e, 113 w, 155 f
15 . . . 53 g, 112 n

Isaiah

29, 16 . . . 147 *c*, 150 *f*
 19 . 118 *l*, 132 *c*, 133 *h*
 23 131 *o*
 30, 1 69 *h*, N.
 2 63 *i*, 72 *q*
 5 78 *b*
 6 135 *p*
 8 61 *f*, 135 *p*
 11 102 *b*
 12 . 61 *d*, 111 *v*, 114 *d*,
 114 *r*
 13 116 *d*
 14 . 63 *i*, 113 *i*, 156 *g*
 18 67 *cc*, 130 *a*
 19 58 *g*, 75 *U*
 20 131 *c*, 145 *n*
 21 56
 22 135 *n*, 145 *m*
 23 93 *ss*
 24 52 *s*
 26 114 *r*, 134 *r*
 28 72 *s*
 31 156 *d*
 33 32 *l*
 31, 2 141 *f*
 3 75 *u*
 5 67 *p*, 113 *t*
 6 . 138 *f*, N. 2, 144 *b*
 8 125 *c*, 152 *a*
 32, 1 143 *e*
 7 154 *a*, N.
 9 44 *o*
 11 . 48 *i*, 67 *o*, 110 *k*
 12 116 *s*, 144 *i*
 13 128 *c*
 17 113 *c*
 18 124 *e*
 33, 1 . 20 *h*, 53 *q*, 53 *u*,
 67 *v*, 120 *b*, 156 *f*
 3 67 *dd*
 4 85 *h*
 5 116 *s*
 6 130 *b*
 7 75 *u*
 9 29 *g*, 145 *t*
 10 54 *c*
 12 20 *i*
 14 84 *as*, 117 *bb*
 15 . 117 *r*, N. 2, 119 *s*
 16 124 *b*
 19 67 *n*
 20 152 *t*
 34, 4 67 *t*, 126 *o*
 5 52 *h*
 6 54 *n*
 10 102 *i*
 11 21 *c*, 80 *g*
 13 117 *s*
 17 59 *g*
 35, 1 47 *n*

Isaiah

35, 2 113 *w*, 130 *b*
 4 65 *f*
 7 135 *p*
 9 84 *b*, 132 *c*
 36, 2 128 *w*, N.
 9 119 *s*, 119 *u*
 11 2 *a*
 14 74 *l*
 16 110 *f*, 127 *f*
 17 114 *r*
 37, 3 69 *m*, 152 *h*
 4 138 *a*
 11 150 *a*
 14 124 *b*, N.
 17 10 *g*
 19 113 *f*, 113 *s*
 22 130 *e*
 24 128 *r*
 26 . 75 *qq*, 114 *k*, 117 *ii*
 28 114 *c*
 29 112 *mn*
 30 . 113 *s*, 113 *ce*, 126 *b*
 38, 3 16 *f*, N., 157 *c*
 5 . 50 *e*, 113 *bb*, 155 *f*
 9 114 *r*
 10 108 *f*, 121 *d*
 14 48 *i*, 61 *f*, N.
 15 55 *g*
 16 . 75 *mm*, 103 *g*,
 135 *p*
 17 119 *ff*
 18 116 *h*, 152 *s*
 20 86 *i*, 114 *i*
 39, 1 124 *b*, N.
 40, 3 146 *b*
 4 93 *v*
 6 112 *qq*, 127 *c*
 9 119 *s*
 10 119 *i*
 11 93 *x*
 14 124 *e*
 18 15 *c*, 75 *dd*
 19 119 *hh*
 20 155 *f*, 156 *g*
 22 126 *b*
 26 124 *e*
 29 152 *v*
 30 69 *q*
 31 8 *h*
 41, 1 119 *gg*
 2 . 35 *n*, N. 1, 75 *gg*,
 155 *n*
 4 P. 459, N.
 5 75 *u*
 7 29 *f*
 8 138 *d*
 10 75 *bb*
 12 76 *d*
 15 96
 17 20 *i*

Isaiah

41, 23 . 48 *g*, N. 2, 75 *l*,
 75 *v*, 109 *d*
 24 155 *n*
 25 23 *d*, 76 *d*
 42, 4 67 *q*
 5 . 65 *d*, 93 *ss*, 124 *k*
 6 . 107 *b*, N. 1, 109 *k*
 10 91 *f*
 18 . 35 *g*, 126 *e*, 126 *f*
 20 75 *n*, 144 *p*
 21 120 *c*
 22 29 *g*, 124 *g*
 24 113 *d*, 138 *g*
 25 131 *k*
 43, 1 . . 61 *h*, 74 *c*, 91 *d*
 2 159 *dd*, 159 *ff*
 6 122 *v*
 8 . 53 *m*, 69 *v*, 74 *l*
 9 51 *o*
 10 P. 459, N.
 25 141 *k*
 44, 3 71
 9 5 *n*
 13 64 *i*
 15 103 *f*, N. 3
 16 67 *cc*
 18 72 *dd*
 21 . 20 *f*, 57, N. 3,
 117 *x*
 22 72 *y*
 28 53 *n*, 114 *p*
 45, 1 67 *p*
 2 70 *b*
 4 111 *b*, N. 2
 9 152 *n*
 10 47 *o*
 14 10 *g*
 46, 5 75 *dd*
 47, 1 120 *c*
 2 46 *d*, 63 *l*
 8 90 *m*
 10 . 61 *h*, 75 *v*, 116 *f*
 12 138 *f*
 14 28 *b*, 67 *cc*
 48, 8 52 *k*
 9 119 *hh*
 11 67 *t*
 14 119 *hh*
 17 93 *qq*
 18 111 *x*, 151 *c*
 49, 6 . 67 *t*, 115 *a*, 142 *f*,
 N. 2
 7 111 *q*
 11 145 *n*
 15 160 *b*
 18 32 *c*
 19 67 *dd*
 21 72 *p*
 23 . 122 *f*, N., 156 *c*
 26 135 *l*

Isaiah

50, 2 . . . 133*c*, 180*m*, 152*y*
 8 . . . 15*c*, 20*f*
 9 . . . 130*c*
 11 . . . 20*n*
 51, 1 . . . 155*k*
 2 . . . 107*b*, N. 1
 9 . . . 72*s*, 118*u*
 10 . . . 93*pp*, 138*k*
 11 . . . 111*m*
 12 . . . 50*f*
 13 . . . 52*k*
 17 . . . 128*q*
 19 . . . 47*b*, 122*q*
 21 . . . 130*b*
 52, 7 . . . 73*g*, 106*g*
 8 . . . 117*a*, N. 2, 146*b*
 11 . . . 67*t*
 12 . . . 61*n*
 14 . . . 93*q*
 53, 2 . . . 106*a*
 3 . . . 96, 128*t*
 4 . . . 116*l*, 117*ii*
 5 . . . 55*b*, 121*a*, 128*q*
 8 . . . 103*f*, N. 3
 9 . . . 160*c*
 10 . . . 74*k*, 75*ii*
 11 . . . 117*m*, 120*h*, 132*b*
 54, 1 . . . 67*ff*, 144*p*, 155*f*
 4 . . . 91*l*
 5 . . . 124*k*, 124*k*, N. 3
 6 . . . 58*g*
 10 . . . 103*b*
 11 . . . 152*a*, N.
 12 . . . 21*d*
 14 . . . 54*c*, 110*c*
 15 . . . 159*w*
 55, 2 . . . 152*a*
 3 . . . 93*m*
 9 . . . 161*b*
 56, 3 . . . 138*k*
 4 . . . 138*f*
 8 . . . 20*m*
 9 . . . 29*t*
 57, 4 . . . 93*m*
 5 . . . 67*u*
 6 . . . 20*h*
 8 . . . 47*k*
 17 . . . 113*k*
 20 . . . 113*d*
 58, 3 . . . 20*h*, 19*c*, 150*m*
 9 . . . 65*a*, 115*b*
 13 . . . 119*hh*
 59, 3 . . . 51*h*
 5 . . . 73*d*, 80*i*
 9 . . . 93*r*
 10 . . . 152*v*
 12 . . . 67*k*
 13 . . . 52*e*, 75*m*, 113*d*
 14 . . . 72*ee*
 21 . . . 143*a*

Isaiah

60, 4 . . . 51*m*, 122*w*
 9 . . . 58*g*
 14 . . . 118*q*, 125*k*
 61, 1 . . . 84*b* *n*
 7 . . . 60*e*, 119*hh*
 62, 2 . . . 16*f*, 20*m*
 12 . . . 152*a*, N.
 63, 3 . . . 107*b*, N. 1, 53*p*,
 76*c*
 11 . . . 128*e*
 16 . . . 60*d*
 19 . . . 151*e*, 155*m*
 64, 3 . . . 75*hh*
 6 . . . 72*cc*
 65, 1 . . . 51*c*, 155*n*
 5 . . . 117*x*
 14 . . . 70*d*
 17 . . . 51*m*
 18 . . . 110*c*
 20 . . . 75*oo*
 66, 13 . . . 155*d*
 18 . . . 167*b*

Jeremiah

1, 10 . . . 45*g*
 13 . . . 90*e*
 2, 2 . . . 49*k*
 8 . . . 155*n*
 11 . . . 72*e*
 12 . . . 46*d*
 15 . . . 44*m*
 16 . . . 117*ll*
 17 . . . 116*g*, N. 2
 19 . . . 60*a*
 20 . . . 44*h*, N. 2
 21 . . . 126*s*
 24 . . . 60*e*, 122*c*
 27 . . . 59*h*, 69*s*
 31 . . . 85*k*
 33 . . . 44*k*
 35 . . . 114*d*
 36 . . . 68*k*
 3, 1 . . . 113*ee*, 159*w*
 5 . . . 47*k*, 66*f*, 69*r*
 6 . . . 75*ii*, 132*b*
 7 . . . 84*a* *k*
 8 . . . 91*l*
 9 . . . 112*ss*
 15 . . . 113*k*
 22 . . . 75*pp*, 75*rr*
 4, 2 . . . 10*g*
 5 . . . 120*h*
 7 . . . 20*h*, 93*t*
 11 . . . 67*v*
 13 . . . 67*ee*
 18 . . . 75*n*
 19 . . . 108*g*, 133*l*, N. 3
 29 . . . 123*b*
 30 . . . 145*t*
 5, 6 . . . 20*b*, 67*cc*

Jeremiah

5, 7 . . . 65*b*
 13 . . . 52*o*, 138*i*
 15 . . . 155*k*
 22 . . . 58*i*, 58*k*, 60*e*
 26 . . . 67*p*
 28 . . . 117*s*
 6, 5 . . . 10*g*
 8 . . . 51*c*, 152*a*, N.
 10 . . . 108*g*
 11 . . . 121*d*
 17 . . . 112*dd*
 20 . . . 126*x*
 28 . . . 133*i*
 29 . . . 67*u*
 7, 4 . . . 133*l*, N. 3
 9 . . . 112*o*, 113*ee*
 10 . . . 97*g*
 19 . . . 57, N. 2, 135*k*
 8, 4 . . . 150*m*
 5 . . . 128*c*
 11 . . . 75*gg*, 133*l*, 155*n*
 13 . . . 72*aa*, 113*w*
 14 . . . 67*dd*
 19 . . . 100*m*, 102*m*
 9, 1 . . . 108*f*, 151*b*
 2 . . . 53*n*, 119*u*
 3 . . . 63*c*
 4 . . . 53*q*, 113*d*
 11 . . . 109*i*
 12 . . . 114*r*
 17 . . . 74*k*
 23 . . . 113*d*, 113*g*, 144*e*
 10, 3 . . . 145*u*, N. 2
 4 . . . 109*g*
 5 . . . 23*i*, 47*n*, 75*oo*
 11 . . . 1*c*
 17 . . . 46*d*
 18 . . . 67*ee*
 19 . . . 63*c*, 126*y*
 22 . . . 146*b*
 23 . . . 72*z*
 11, 7 . . . 113*k*
 15 . . . 53*n*, 90*g*, 91*e*
 16 . . . 84*a* *g*
 19 . . . 45*g*
 12, 4 . . . 145*k*
 5 . . . 55*k*
 9 . . . 68*i*
 13, 10 . . . 52*s*
 14 . . . 127*e*
 16 . . . 144*c*
 17 . . . 69*p*
 19 . . . 75*m*, 118*q*
 21 . . . 64*a*
 14, 1 . . . p. 468, N.
 16 . . . 103*g*
 18 . . . 155*k*, 159*p*
 15, 10 . . . 91*c*, N.
 18 . . . 50*f*, 102*l*
 16, 16 . . . 73*b*, 132*b*

Jeremiah

17, 2	. . .	28 a, 45 g
7 93 oo
8 53 m
11 161 a
17 75 h h
18	. . .	72 y, 74 l
18, 7 45 g
23 75 ii
19, 5 144 b
8 75 q q
15 74 k
20, 9	. 21 d, 112 k k, 132 d	
15 59 f
17	. 111 l, 122 n, N. 2	
21, 1 115 i
13 66 f
22, 14 87 g
15	. 10 g, 55 h, 142 g	
19 113 k
20 10 h, 46 d
22 22 s
23	. 23 f, N. 1, 80 d	
24 58 i
26 72 k
28 10 g
29 133 l, N. 3
23, 6	. 20 d, 60 c, 74 e	
14 152 x
32 52 s
33 117 m, N. 3
37 58 f, 75 ll
39 23 l
24, 7 115 c
25, 3 53 k
15 131 k
26 127 g
27 76 h
34 91 l
36 24 e
26, 5 113 k
6 8 k, 37 b
9 75 q q
27, 16 90 e
18 72 o, 76 g
20 53 q
29, 1 53 p
8 53 o
17 132 e
23 64 e
25 124 b, N. 3
30, 11 113 n
16 67 s
26 134 m
31, 1 75 h h
2 113 d d
3 117 x
18 51 c
21 44 h, 126 y
22 47 o
28 45 g

Jeremiah

31, 32	. 63 o, 138 b, N. 3	
33 60 a
38 17 b
40 127 g
32, 4 51 k
10 126 s
12 127 h
14 124 b, N. 3
35 74 k
38, 20 128 d
22 116 g, N. 2
34, 9 132 d
36, 33 117 l
37, 3 53 q
11 112 m u
12 53 q
15 112 ll
16 87 i
26, 4 75 r r
9 111 l
11 8 h
12 93 x
14 126 w
16 17 b
23 144 i
26 115 a
28 112 q q
39, 7 53, 72 s
12 22 s
14 115 c
40, 3 112 q q
4 35 d
16 75 h h
41, 6 113 u
12 119 g
42, 2 75 ff
6 17 a, 32 d
10 19 i
16 112 y
44, 8 8 k
18 67 c
19	. 53 k, 58 g, 144 u	
21 52 o
23 74 g
25 72 k, 146 g
46, 1	. . .	p. 468, N. 3
8 68 i
16 126 w
20 84 b n
47, 4 45 g, 67 c c
48, 2 67 t
11 72 d d
15 145 u
31 70 d
32 127 f
36 80 g
45 119 w
46, 3 54 b
8 46 a, N. 1
10 75 p p

Jeremiah

49, 11	. . .	47 k, 60 a, N. 3
12 141 k
16 147 c
25 80 g
28 20 b, 67 c c
30 20 g
36 20 m
37 67 d d
50, 5 51 o
11 80 k
34 53 l, 73 d
51, 3	. 17 b, 152 k, N. 3	
9 75 q q
29 111 w, N. 1
33 53 l
56 20 k, 52 k
58 20 i
59 134 p
52, 20 128 d

Ezekiel

1, 6	. . .	87 l, 88 f
11 91 l
14 113 s, N. 2
20 123 d, N. 2
2, 3 126 x
10 19 k
4, 9 87 e
12 58 k
5, 11 72 r, 109 d
12	. 52 n, 75 h h, 95 e	
13 54 c
16 109 d
6, 3 93 v
6	. 67 p, N. 2, 67 d d	
8 91 l
9 72 d d
10 119 i i
11 128 c
12 91 e
14 133 l
7, 7 127 g
14	. 72 s, 113 s, N. 3	
24 93 oo
8, 2 90 f
3 75 q q
16 75 k k
9, 2 116 k
3	. 116 k, 121 d, N. 2	
8 64 i
11 116 k
10, 3	. 131 n, 131 m, N. 2	
15 72 d d
17 72 g, 72 d d
11, 24 90 c
13, 2 93 oo
3 152 x, 155 n
11 35 m
18	. 87 f, 103 f, N. 2	
19 72 k, 93 r

Ezekiel

13, 20 32 *i*, 91 *l*
 14, 3 51 *k*, 51 *p*
 14 112 *ll*
 22 117 *l*, 126 *w*
 16, 4 22 *s*, 52 *g*, 53 *s*,
 64 *e*, 71
 5 71
 6 123 *d*, N. 2
 10 49 *c*
 27 131 *r*
 31 91 *l*
 32 117 *d*
 33 64 *c*
 45 96
 47 103 *m*
 50 47 *e*
 51 96
 52 52 *p*, 91 *n*, 95 *p*, 96
 53 91 *e*, 91 *f*
 54 103 *b*
 55 72 *k*
 57 72 *p*
 59 44 *i*
 17, 5 19 *i*
 7 52 *d*
 9 45 *e*, 93 *m*
 15 29 *i*, 93 *rr*
 19 67 *v*
 21 117 *m*
 18, 6 131 *c*
 7 131 *r*
 10 119 *w*, N. 2, 139 *d*
 14 103 *l*
 29 145 *u*
 32 139 *d*
 19, 2 80 *k*
 12 53 *u*
 20, 9 67 *t*
 16 117 *m*
 22 112 *ff*
 37 23 *f*
 38 145 *u*
 21, 15 75 *n*
 18 64 *d*
 21 73 *a*
 22 124 *o*
 29 53 *l*
 31 80 *k*, 113 *bb*, N. 2
 32 133 *l*
 33 45 *c*, 68 *i*
 35 72 *y*
 22, 4 47 *k*
 18 131 *d*
 20 66 *f*
 23, 20 48 *d*
 28 91 *e*, 138 *e*
 32 47 *k*
 42 21 *c*
 44 96
 45 103 *b*

Ezekiel

23, 47 103 *b*
 48 55 *k*, 91 *f*
 49 74 *k*, 76 *b*, 144 *a*
 24, 11 67 *q*
 19 75 *m*
 26 53 *e*, 54 *k*
 25, 3 67 *u*
 4 91 *e*
 6 23 *c*, 74 *e*
 26, 2 67 *t*
 10 130 *b*
 14 47 *k*
 15 51 *l*
 17 138 *k*
 21 10 *g*
 27, 19 20 *i*
 31 80 *k*
 32 23 *k*
 34 116 *g*, N. 2
 28, 4 32 *g*
 16 23 *d*, 68 *k*, 75 *qg*,
 111 *w*, N. 1
 17 75 *n*
 23 55 *d*
 24 72 *p*
 29, 3 117 *x*
 7 127 *c*
 30, 9 93 *y*
 16 73 *d*
 31, 3 67 *v*
 5 44 *f*
 7 76 *f*
 16 128 *a*, N. 1
 32, 12 51 *n*
 19 46 *a*, N. 1
 30 20 *m*, 72 *n*
 32 53 *s*
 33, 17 143 *a*, N. 3
 26 44 *k*
 34, 2 57, N. 2
 8 57, N. 2
 10 149 *c*, 167 *b*
 21 103 *b*
 31 32 *i*
 35, 6 10 *k*
 9 72 *k*
 10 117 *m*
 12 84 *be*
 36, 3 67 *r*, 75 *y*, 113 *g*
 5 91 *e*
 11 70 *e*
 12 69 *s*
 25 34 *f*
 37, 2 112 *pp*
 7 60 *a*, N.
 8 9 *u*, 29 *i*
 11 116 *t*, 119 *s*
 16 66 *g*, 119 *u*
 17 52 *n*, 64 *k*
 19 117 *m*, N. 3

Ezekiel

38, 21 49 *l*
 23 54 *k*
 39, 2 55 *f*
 26 75 *qg*
 40, 3 74 *l*
 4 74 *d*
 5 134 *n*
 16 91 *l*
 17 121 *d*
 19 80 *k*
 27 134 *g*
 28 126 *w*
 31 93 *ss*
 43 20 *m*
 45 136 *d*, N.
 48 92 *g*
 41, 7 67 *dd*
 15 91 *l*
 18 121 *d*
 20 5 *n*
 22 141 *b*
 42, 5 68 *k*
 43, 7 117 *m*
 17 103 *o*
 27 75 *rr*
 44, 3 117 *m*
 8 58 *g*
 9 93 *hh*, 143 *e*
 12 112 *e*, N. 1
 45, 2 65 *d*
 46, 6 132 *g*, N. 1
 17 72 *o*
 22 53 *g*, 53 *s*
 23 121 *d*
 24 124 *r*
 47, 3 128 *n*
 4 131 *e*
 7 91 *e*
 8 75 *oo*
 17 117 *m*
 48, 14 72 *dd*

Hosea

1, 2 52 *o*, 130 *d*
 6 120 *g*, 152 *a*, N.
 7 119 *o*
 2, 1 130 *c*
 3 96
 5 72 *w*
 6 52 *n*
 11 120 *e*
 14 91 *e*
 25 152 *a*, N.
 3, 1 125 *c*
 2 20 *k*
 5 27 *v*, N. 2
 4, 2 113 *ff*
 14 155 *f*
 15 145 *m*
 18 55 *e*

Hosea

5, 2	64 <i>a</i>
3	135 <i>a</i>
8	147 <i>c</i>
15	60 <i>e</i>
6, 1	109 <i>k</i>
2	119 <i>y</i> , N. 1, 134 <i>s</i>
3	155 <i>g</i>
4	120 <i>g</i>
6	133 <i>b</i>
9	23 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>aa</i> , 93 <i>s</i>
10	114 <i>l</i>
7, 4	80 <i>k</i>
5	55 <i>f</i> , 93 <i>s</i>
6	91 <i>c</i>
12	24 <i>f</i> , 70 <i>b</i>
14	70 <i>d</i>
16	34 <i>b</i> , N. 1
8, 3	60 <i>d</i>
4	67 <i>v</i>
7	90 <i>f</i>
9	119 <i>s</i>
10	20 <i>g</i> , 111 <i>w</i> , N. 1
9, 6	130 <i>a</i>
9	120 <i>g</i>
11	69 <i>m</i>
12	159 <i>m</i>
15	109 <i>d</i>
10, 4	75 <i>n</i>
6	121 <i>w</i>
10	60 <i>a</i> , 71
11	90 <i>l</i>
14	9 <i>b</i> , 23 <i>g</i> , 53 <i>u</i> , 72 <i>p</i> , 156 <i>c</i>
15	133 <i>i</i>
11, 1	68 <i>f</i>
3	19 <i>i</i> , 55 <i>k</i>
4	68 <i>c</i>
7	75 <i>rr</i>
12, 1	124 <i>k</i>
5	58 <i>k</i>
13, 2	91 <i>c</i>
3	120 <i>g</i>
8	122 <i>e</i>
10	150 <i>l</i>
14	93 <i>q</i>
15	75 <i>rr</i>
14, 1	84 <i>ag</i> , 145 <i>u</i>
3	128 <i>e</i>
4	68 <i>f</i>
10	69 <i>b</i> , 166 <i>a</i> , N. 1

Joel

1, 2	100 <i>n</i> , 126 <i>e</i> , 150 <i>g</i>
4	49 <i>m</i>
5	126 <i>e</i>
6	152 <i>v</i>
7	113 <i>n</i>
8	63 <i>l</i> , 116 <i>k</i>
12	102 <i>b</i>
15	147 <i>d</i>

Joel

1, 17	20 <i>k</i>
18	148 <i>a</i>
20	145 <i>k</i>
2, 2	109 <i>d</i>
4	72 <i>u</i> , 126 <i>p</i>
6	23 <i>d</i>
13	152 <i>g</i>
16	128 <i>y</i>
17	150 <i>e</i>
21	46 <i>e</i>
22	144 <i>a</i>
24	93 <i>r</i>
26	114 <i>o</i>
4, 1	125 <i>k</i>
4	133 <i>k</i>
31	64 <i>k</i>
14	123 <i>e</i> , 147 <i>c</i>
18	117 <i>s</i>
21	49 <i>k</i> , 75 <i>s</i>

Amos

1, 3	134 <i>s</i> , 158 <i>c</i>
5	145 <i>c</i>
8	145 <i>e</i>
9	114 <i>r</i> , 158 <i>c</i>
11	58 <i>g</i> , 112 <i>i</i> , 114 <i>r</i>
2, 6	61 <i>b</i>
7	126 <i>b</i>
9	53 <i>n</i>
10	69 <i>x</i>
16	118 <i>n</i>
3, 4	163 <i>c</i>
5	113 <i>q</i>
7	103 <i>c</i>
8	159 <i>k</i>
9	124 <i>e</i>
11	67 <i>t</i> , 88 <i>f</i> , 154 <i>a</i> , N.
12	126 <i>r</i>
4, 1	135 <i>o</i> , 144 <i>a</i>
2	75 <i>oo</i> , 112 <i>x</i>
3	44 <i>k</i> , 69 <i>u</i>
4	113 <i>s</i>
7	112 <i>k</i> , N. 3, 144 <i>c</i>
8	134 <i>s</i>
9	126 <i>n</i>
11	51 <i>o</i> , 115 <i>d</i>
13	116 <i>g</i> , N. 2
5, 2	128 <i>k</i>
3	117 <i>s</i> , 129 <i>g</i>
4	110 <i>f</i>
7	126 <i>b</i>
8	111 <i>u</i> , 117 <i>ii</i>
11	61 <i>c</i>
14	109 <i>k</i> , 152 <i>g</i>
15	67 <i>cc</i>
18	152 <i>d</i>
19	112 <i>m</i> , 126 <i>r</i>
21	20 <i>k</i> , 106 <i>g</i> , 154 <i>a</i> , N.
26	112 <i>x</i> , 112 <i>rr</i>
6, 1	112 <i>n</i>

Amos

6, 2	125 <i>k</i> , 126 <i>s</i>
6	63 <i>c</i> , 93 <i>k</i> , 119 <i>m</i> , N.
10	145 <i>m</i> , 152 <i>s</i>
12	123 <i>a</i> , N., 144 <i>d</i>
13	152 <i>a</i> , N.
14	125 <i>c</i>
7, 1	86 <i>i</i> , 147 <i>b</i>
2	112 <i>uu</i>
4	112 <i>ll</i>
7	156 <i>b</i>
15	119 <i>b</i>
8, 4	53 <i>q</i>
8	125 <i>c</i>
10	128 <i>k</i> , 135 <i>p</i>
13	54 <i>k</i> , 146 <i>g</i>
9, 1	61 <i>g</i> , 144 <i>c</i>
3	112 <i>p</i>
7	150 <i>c</i>
8	53 <i>k</i> , 113 <i>n</i> , 113 <i>v</i>
11	116 <i>d</i> , 118 <i>u</i>
13	54 <i>k</i>

Obadiah

1, 3	90 <i>l</i> , 93 <i>x</i>
10	128 <i>a</i>
11	9 <i>w</i> , 61 <i>f</i> , 69 <i>u</i>
13	47 <i>k</i>

Jonah

1, 3	116 <i>d</i> , 122 <i>t</i> , 135 <i>p</i>
5	51 <i>m</i>
6	120 <i>b</i>
7	150 <i>k</i>
9	2 <i>b</i>
10	117 <i>q</i>
11	113 <i>m</i> , 165 <i>a</i>
14	16 <i>f</i>
15	61 <i>c</i>
2, 2	122 <i>s</i>
4	117 <i>r</i>
3, 5	133 <i>g</i>
4, 1	117 <i>q</i>
2	16 <i>f</i> , 114 <i>n</i> , N. 3
6	117 <i>q</i>
9	113 <i>k</i>
10	96, 128 <i>v</i>
11	20 <i>m</i> , 97 <i>b</i> , 150 <i>a</i>

Micah

1, 1	145 <i>m</i>
2	135 <i>r</i>
5	23 <i>c</i> , 137 <i>a</i>
7	52 <i>l</i> , 67 <i>y</i> , 117 <i>ii</i>
8	69 <i>b</i> , N., 118 <i>n</i>
10	113 <i>v</i>
11	122 <i>s</i> , 131 <i>c</i>
13	110 <i>k</i>
15	74 <i>k</i>
2, 3	118 <i>q</i>

Micah

- 2, 4. 67 *u*, 144 *d*, 148 *b*
 6. . . . 72 *dd*, 145 *o*
 7. . . . 100 *n*, 118 *n*
 8. . . . 116 *h*
 12. . . . 72 *k*, 127 *i*
 3, 1. . . . 114 *l*
 4. . . . 109 *h*
 6. . . . 119 *w*, 144 *c*
 12. . . . 87 *e*, 121 *d*
 4, 3. . . . 91 *n*, 145 *c*
 6. 68 *h*, 84 *a*, 122 *s*
 8. . . . 68 *f*
 9. . . . 113 *w*
 10. 10 *k*, 76 *g*, 145 *n*
 11. . . . 119 *dd*
 12. . . . 90 *i*
 13. 44 *h*, 72 *q*, 117 *ii*
 14. . . . 119 *o*
 5, 1. . . . 135 *g*, 142 *g*
 2. . . . 106 *o*, 155 *l*
 4. 72 *i*, 128 *l*, 134 *s*
 6, 1. . . . 138 *e*
 3. 53 *p*, 75 *ee*, 163 *b*
 5. . . . 117 *gg*
 8. . . . 163 *d*
 9. . . . 146 *b*
 10. . . . 47 *b*, 118 *g*
 11. . . . 47 *b*
 13. . . . 115 *c*
 7, 1. . . . 93 *p*
 2. 117 *ff*, 119 *i*, 152 *k*
 3. . . . 135 *f*
 4. . . . 133 *e*, 133 *g*
 8. . . . 122 *s*
 10. 75 *p*, 75 *w*, 75 *hh*,
 145 *n*
 11. . . . 126 *x*
 12. . . . 126 *aa*
 14. . . . 90 *m*
 17. . . . 116 *h*
 18. . . . 148 *c*
 19. . . . 120 *g*

Nahum

- 1, 2. . . . 5 *h*
 3. . . . 75 *hh*, 143 *a*
 4. . . . 69 *u*
 12. . . . 67 *t*
 2, 4. . . . 52 *q*
 5. . . . 55 *g*, 93 *ss*
 8. . . . 63 *p*, 91 *c*
 11. . . . 133 *l*
 14. . . . 91 *l*
 3, 5. . . . 53 *p*
 7. . . . 52 *q*, 67 *cc*
 8. . . . 70 *e*, 133 *b*
 9. . . . 91 *e*
 10. . . . 69 *u*
 11. . . . 145 *p*
 15. . . . 110 *a*, 110 *k*

Nahum

- 3, 17. . . . 20 *h*

Habakkuk

- 1, 5. . . . 116 *s*
 6. . . . 13 *c*, 155 *e*
 8. . . . 67 *ee*
 14. . . . 152 *u*
 15. . . . 63 *p*
 16. . . . 103 *g*
 17. . . . 114 *h*, 156 *g*
 2, 1. . . . 37 *b*
 3. . . . 72 *dd*
 6. . . . 147 *c*
 10. . . . 116 *s*, 118 *p*
 12. . . . 112 *n*
 14. 90 *n*, 116 *f*, N. 1,
 155 *g*
 15. . . . 90 *m*, 113 *s*
 17. . . . 20 *n*, 60 *d*, 67 *v*
 19. . . . 152 *p*
 3, 2. . . . 75 *mm*
 6. . . . 67 *k*, 67 *ee*
 8. . . . 131 *r*
 9. . . . 113 *w*
 10. . . . 91 *l*
 13. 22 *s*, 75 *aa*, 75 *n*,
 113 *k*
 15. . . . 144 *m*
 16. . . . 156 *e*
 17. . . . 145 *u*
 19. . . . 86 *i*

Zephaniah

- 1, 2. 72 *aa*, 113 *w*, N. 3
 14. . . . 52 *s*
 2, 2. . . . 152 *y*
 7. . . . 135 *p*
 9. . . . 8 *k*
 15. . . . 152 *s*
 3, 1. . . . 75 *rr*
 7. . . . 120 *g*
 11. . . . 135 *n*
 16. . . . 145 *p*
 18. . . . 69 *t*
 20. . . . 91 *l*

Haggai

- 1, 1. . . . 129 *f*
 4. 126 *s*, 131 *h*, N. 1,
 135 *g*
 6. . . . 113 *s*
 9. . . . 37 *f*
 2, 5. . . . 44 *o*, 117 *l*
 7. . . . 145 *e*
 17. 72 *v*, 117 *m*, N. 3,
 152 *n*

Zechariah

- 1, 8. . . . 132 *c*
 13. . . . 131 *c*

Zechariah

- 1, 14. . . . 117 *q*
 17. . . . 72 *k*
 2, 8. . . . 118 *r*
 10. . . . 154 *b*
 11. . . . 290 *n*, 2
 17. . . . 72 *ee*
 3, 1. . . . 115 *c*
 4. . . . 113 *s*
 7. . . . 53 *o*
 8. . . . 126 *e*
 9. 88 *f*, 97 *c*, 122 *n*
 4, 2. . . . 91 *e*, 97 *c*
 7. . . . 126 *x*
 10. 72 *dd*, 126 *w*, 127 *h*
 12. . . . 10 *g*
 5, 2. . . . 134 *n*
 3. . . . 75 *mm*
 4. . . . 73 *d*, 80 *i*
 7. 74 *i*, 136 *d*, N.
 9. . . . 74 *k*
 10. . . . 32 *n*
 11. 23 *k*, 72 *ee*, 103 *g*
 6, 7. . . . 54 *k*
 10. . . . 49 *l*
 12. . . . 155 *e*
 7, 1. . . . 134 *p*
 5. 59 *a*, 113 *s*, 117 *x*,
 135 *e*
 7. . . . 117 *l*
 10. . . . 139 *c*
 14. . . . 52 *n*
 8, 2. . . . 117 *q*
 5. . . . 132 *d*
 6. . . . 150 *a*
 9. . . . 136 *b*
 17. . . . 117 *l*
 23. . . . 157 *a*
 9, 5. . . . 75 *p*, 75 *hh*
 9. 72 *s*, 124 *o*, 154 *a*, N.
 11. . . . 135 *f*, 152 *u*
 12. . . . 116 *s*
 10, 2. . . . 124 *h*
 5. . . . 72 *p*
 6. . . . 72 *x*
 11, 2. . . . 16 *w*
 5. . . . 19 *k*
 7. 96, 130 *g*, 132 *c*,
 133 *h*
 10. . . . 67 *w*
 17. . . . 90 *l*
 12, 10. . . . p. 469, N. 1
 12. . . . 123 *d*
 13, 7. 72 *s*, 110 *k*, 144 *a*
 14, 4. 93 *v*, 128 *w*, N.
 10. . . . 72 *p*
 12. . . . 67 *dd*

Malachi

- 1, 2. . . . 68 *f*
 6. . . . 32 *c*

Malachi

1, 10 . . .	151 <i>a</i> , 153
13 . . .	37 <i>c</i> , 147 <i>c</i>
14 . . .	80 <i>d</i> , N. 1
2, 5 . . .	67 <i>n</i>
15 . . .	144 <i>p</i>
16 . . .	116 <i>s</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
3, 9 . . .	67 <i>n</i>
14 . . .	100 <i>g</i>
20 . . .	44 <i>d</i>

Psalms

1, 2 . . .	163 <i>a</i>
3 . . .	16 <i>g</i> , 107 <i>g</i> , 119 <i>cc</i>
6 . . .	68 <i>c</i>
2, 1 . . .	91 <i>l</i> , 106 <i>l</i>
2 . . .	119 <i>dd</i> , 126 <i>h</i>
3 . . .	108 <i>b</i>
4 . . .	126 <i>h</i>
6 . . .	135 <i>a</i> , 135 <i>n</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
7 . . .	44 <i>d</i> , 69 <i>s</i>
10 . . .	126 <i>h</i> , 154 <i>b</i>
12 . . .	118 <i>g</i> , N. 1, 130 <i>a</i>
3, 1 . . .	129 <i>c</i>
2 . . .	67 <i>ee</i>
3 . . .	90 <i>g</i> , 152 <i>n</i> , N. 1
5 . . .	111 <i>t</i> , 144 <i>m</i>
6 . . .	49 <i>e</i>
8 . . .	72 <i>s</i> , 117 <i>ll</i>
4, 1 . . .	124 <i>f</i>
3 . . .	37 <i>e</i> , 47 <i>m</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
4 . . .	154 <i>b</i>
7 . . .	76 <i>b</i>
8 . . .	133 <i>e</i> , N. 2, 155 <i>l</i>
5, 4 . . .	118 <i>i</i>
5 . . .	116 <i>f</i> , 117 <i>bb</i>
7 . . .	128 <i>t</i>
8 . . .	107 <i>s</i>
9 . . .	24 <i>f</i> , 70 <i>b</i>
10 . . .	122 <i>g</i> , 124 <i>e</i> , 145 <i>m</i> , 152 <i>o</i>
11 . . .	29 <i>e</i>
12 . . .	116 <i>g</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
13 . . .	117 <i>ee</i>
6, 2 . . .	152 <i>h</i>
4 . . .	147 <i>c</i>
6 . . .	152 <i>o</i>
7 . . .	106 <i>g</i>
10 . . .	142 <i>f</i>
7, 3 . . .	152 <i>l</i>
4 . . .	159 <i>m</i>
5 . . .	49 <i>e</i>
6 . . .	63 <i>n</i>
7 . . .	72 <i>s</i> , 119 <i>gg</i> , 156 <i>d</i>
10 . . .	124 <i>g</i> , 132 <i>h</i> , 158 <i>a</i>
12 . . .	127 <i>b</i>
13 . . .	120 <i>g</i>
16 . . .	155 <i>h</i>
17 . . .	10 <i>h</i>
8, 2 . . .	66 <i>h</i>
3 . . .	128 <i>a</i>

Psalms

8, 4 . . .	159 <i>dd</i>
5 . . .	107 <i>v</i> , 111 <i>m</i> , 150 <i>h</i>
6 . . .	117 <i>cc</i>
9, 1 . . .	5 <i>h</i>
2 . . .	13 <i>c</i> , 138 <i>g</i>
7 . . .	135 <i>f</i>
11 . . .	106 <i>h</i>
14 . . .	20 <i>b</i> , 63 <i>l</i>
15 . . .	91 <i>l</i>
19 . . .	152 <i>s</i>
10, 1 . . .	5 <i>h</i>
2 . . .	66 <i>c</i>
5 . . .	141 <i>c</i>
9 . . .	91 <i>e</i>
10 . . .	93 <i>x</i>
11 . . .	106 <i>g</i>
12 . . .	76 <i>b</i>
11, 1 . . .	118 <i>r</i> , 129 <i>c</i> , 148 <i>b</i>
2 . . .	47 <i>m</i>
4 . . .	145 <i>u</i> , 155 <i>e</i>
6 . . .	109 <i>k</i>
7 . . .	103 <i>f</i>
12, 3 . . .	117 <i>t</i> , 123 <i>f</i>
4 . . .	122 <i>g</i>
7 . . .	108 <i>g</i> , 97 <i>h</i>
8 . . .	126 <i>y</i>
9 . . .	54 <i>k</i>
13, 4 . . .	117 <i>r</i> , N. 2
5 . . .	44 <i>e</i> , 59 <i>i</i> , 152 <i>s</i>
14, 1 . . .	154 <i>a</i> , N. 1
3 . . .	152 <i>o</i>
5 . . .	117 <i>p</i>
7 . . .	151 <i>b</i>
15, 2 . . .	118 <i>m</i>
16, 1 . . .	48 <i>i</i> , 61 <i>f</i> , N. 1
2 . . .	44 <i>i</i>
3 . . .	130 <i>d</i> , 143 <i>e</i>
4 . . .	93 <i>m</i> , 145 <i>p</i> , 155 <i>f</i>
5 . . .	50 <i>e</i>
6 . . .	80 <i>g</i> , 122 <i>g</i>
8 . . .	116 <i>s</i>
9 . . .	111 <i>r</i>
11 . . .	114 <i>m</i> , 122 <i>g</i>
17, 3 . . .	59 <i>h</i> , 67 <i>ee</i>
4 . . .	143 <i>e</i>
9 . . .	138 <i>g</i>
10 . . .	91 <i>f</i>
12 . . .	126 <i>p</i>
13 . . .	144 <i>m</i>
18, 1 . . .	2 <i>s</i> , 53 <i>l</i> , 130 <i>d</i> , 154 <i>a</i> , N. 1
3 . . .	155 <i>i</i>
4 . . .	116 <i>e</i> , 132 <i>b</i>
7 . . .	108 <i>g</i> , N. 3, 107 <i>b</i>
10 . . .	69 <i>p</i>
12 . . .	109 <i>k</i>
17 . . .	117 <i>g</i>
18 . . .	126 <i>s</i>
22 . . .	119 <i>ff</i>
26 . . .	93 <i>s</i>

Psalms

18, 28 . . .	131 <i>f</i>
30 . . .	67 <i>g</i> , 119 <i>e</i>
31 . . .	126 <i>c</i> , 140 <i>d</i> , 143 <i>a</i>
33 . . .	116 <i>f</i> , 116 <i>x</i> , 117 <i>cc</i>
35 . . .	145 <i>k</i>
38 . . .	107 <i>c</i>
40 . . .	116 <i>i</i>
41 . . .	p. 390, N. 1
49 . . .	116 <i>i</i>
19, 3 . . .	20 <i>f</i>
4 . . .	49 <i>h</i>
5 . . .	135 <i>p</i>
6 . . .	122 <i>e</i>
8 . . .	114 <i>i</i>
10 . . .	126 <i>h</i> , 141 <i>c</i>
11 . . .	116 <i>e</i>
14 . . .	67 <i>p</i>
20, 3 . . .	135 <i>m</i>
4 . . .	48 <i>d</i>
21, 2 . . .	126 <i>k</i>
4 . . .	117 <i>ff</i>
7 . . .	117 <i>ii</i> , 124 <i>e</i>
13 . . .	p. 390, N. 1
22, 2 . . .	59 <i>h</i>
3 . . .	152 <i>d</i>
7 . . .	116 <i>l</i>
8 . . .	119 <i>g</i>
9 . . .	144 <i>p</i>
14 . . .	118 <i>r</i>
16 . . .	121 <i>c</i> , 122 <i>n</i>
18 . . .	107 <i>s</i>
22 . . .	23 <i>f</i> , 119 <i>ff</i>
29 . . .	116 <i>s</i>
32 . . .	116 <i>e</i>
23, 2 . . .	124 <i>e</i> , 128 <i>p</i>
4 . . .	107 <i>x</i> , 159 <i>bb</i>
5 . . .	141 <i>c</i> , 141 <i>d</i>
6 . . .	69 <i>m</i> , N. 1
24, 1 . . .	129 <i>c</i> , 130 <i>a</i>
2 . . .	107 <i>b</i>
4 . . .	128 <i>y</i>
10 . . .	136 <i>c</i>
25, 1 . . .	5 <i>h</i>
10 . . .	141 <i>c</i>
11 . . .	112 <i>nn</i>
14 . . .	114 <i>i</i>
26, 2 . . .	48 <i>i</i>
3 . . .	112 <i>gg</i>
7 . . .	53 <i>g</i>
10 . . .	20 <i>f</i>
12 . . .	93 <i>gg</i>
27, 7 . . .	144 <i>m</i>
13 . . .	5 <i>n</i> , 159 <i>dd</i> , 167 <i>a</i>
28, 1 . . .	119 <i>ff</i>
7 . . .	53 <i>g</i>
9 . . .	108
29, 1 . . .	124 <i>g</i>
4 . . .	141 <i>c</i> , N. 3
10 . . .	111 <i>r</i>
30, 2 . . .	60 <i>f</i>

Psalm

30, 4.	69 <i>m</i>
8.	93 <i>aa</i>
31, 21.	93 <i>r</i>
32, 1.	75 <i>qq</i> , 116 <i>k</i>
2.	155 <i>i</i>
6.	143 <i>e</i> , 153
8.	107 <i>q</i> , 138 <i>g</i> , 156 <i>c</i>
9.	114 <i>a</i> , 114 <i>k</i> , 114 <i>s</i>
10.	132 <i>b</i>
33, 5.	116 <i>s</i>
7.	118 <i>w</i>
8.	145 <i>e</i>
10.	67 <i>v</i>
12.	155 <i>h</i>
15.	126 <i>b</i>
34, 1.	5 <i>k</i>
2.	21 <i>d</i>
6.	109 <i>e</i>
9.	155 <i>f</i>
12.	60 <i>f</i>
35, 1.	73 <i>d</i>
8.	156 <i>g</i>
10.	9 <i>u</i>
14.	93 <i>hh</i>
16.	113 <i>k</i>
19.	131 <i>g</i> , N. 3
36, 6.	35 <i>n</i>
8.	75 <i>u</i>
9.	75 <i>u</i>
13.	64 <i>d</i>
37, 1.	5 <i>k</i> , 75 <i>bb</i>
5.	67 <i>n</i>
9.	20 <i>f</i>
14.	45 <i>g</i>
15.	20 <i>h</i>
16.	129 <i>b</i>
20.	290, 75 <i>m</i>
23.	121 <i>f</i>
24.	159 <i>bb</i>
31.	145 <i>k</i>
38, 11.	55 <i>e</i>
21.	61 <i>c</i>
39, 13.	10 <i>h</i>
14.	75 <i>gg</i>
40, 2.	75 <i>aa</i>
5.	93 <i>cc</i>
6.	108 <i>f</i>
15.	290, N. 2
18.	29 <i>q</i>
41, 3.	109 <i>e</i>
5.	74 <i>h</i>
6.	111 <i>t</i>
8.	54 <i>f</i>
42, 2.	122 <i>f</i> , 155 <i>g</i>
4.	115 <i>e</i> , N.
5.	117 <i>x</i>
10.	68 <i>g</i> , 102 <i>l</i>
43, 1.	72 <i>s</i>
2.	102 <i>l</i>
44, 3.	144 <i>m</i>

Psalm

44, 6.	119 <i>o</i>
18.	156 <i>f</i>
20.	119 <i>q</i>
23.	128 <i>q</i>
26.	67 <i>k</i>
27.	72 <i>s</i> , 90 <i>g</i>
45, 3.	55 <i>e</i>
5.	131 <i>c</i>
6.	150, 290, N. 2
8.	117 <i>ee</i>
9.	87 <i>f</i> , 141 <i>d</i>
10.	24 <i>e</i>
12.	75 <i>bb</i> , 109 <i>h</i>
16.	76 <i>g</i>
18.	53 <i>q</i> , 123 <i>c</i>
46, 3.	115 <i>g</i>
4.	132 <i>h</i> , N. 2
5.	124 <i>b</i> , 132 <i>c</i>
7.	119 <i>q</i>
48, 6.	164 <i>b</i> , N. 1
11.	93 <i>g</i> , 93 <i>x</i>
15.	126 <i>aa</i>
49, 6.	102 <i>l</i>
7.	126 <i>b</i>
8.	113 <i>v</i>
14.	155 <i>e</i>
15.	10 <i>g</i> , 67 <i>ee</i> , 114 <i>k</i> , N. 1
50, 3.	109 <i>e</i> , 144 <i>c</i>
4.	115 <i>b</i>
10.	90 <i>n</i>
12.	159 <i>m</i> , 159 <i>r</i>
17.	142 <i>d</i>
21.	112 <i>cc</i> , 157 <i>a</i>
22.	116 <i>b</i>
23.	58 <i>i</i>
51, 4.	75 <i>gg</i> , 120 <i>g</i>
5.	142 <i>f</i>
7.	64 <i>h</i>
9.	165 <i>a</i>
10.	155 <i>h</i>
14.	117 <i>ff</i>
18.	108 <i>f</i>
19.	128 <i>h</i>
52, 15.	58 <i>i</i>
53, 6.	91 <i>e</i> , 116 <i>i</i>
54, 6.	119 <i>i</i>
55, 3.	108 <i>g</i>
7.	128 <i>d</i>
10.	52 <i>n</i>
16.	74 <i>k</i>
18.	108 <i>g</i>
19.	119 <i>gg</i>
22.	10 <i>g</i>
56, 4.	155 <i>l</i>
57, 2.	75 <i>u</i>
5.	144 <i>m</i>
58, 2.	52 <i>n</i>
5.	63 <i>n</i>
9.	69 <i>x</i> , 96, 118 <i>r</i>

Psalm

59, 6.	128 <i>x</i> , 131 <i>s</i>
16.	159 <i>s</i>
60, 4.	75 <i>pp</i>
5.	131 <i>c</i>
13.	80 <i>g</i> , 158 <i>a</i>
61, 1.	80 <i>f</i>
8.	75 <i>cc</i>
62, 4.	52 <i>q</i>
8.	13 <i>c</i>
63, 2.	132 <i>d</i>
4.	60 <i>e</i>
6.	117 <i>t</i>
64, 7.	67 <i>e</i>
8.	117 <i>ff</i>
9.	130 <i>a</i>
65, 6.	92 <i>g</i>
10.	53 <i>n</i> , 60 <i>g</i>
11.	117 <i>y</i>
66, 6.	108 <i>g</i>
17.	144 <i>m</i>
68, 3.	19 <i>c</i> , 51 <i>k</i> , 67 <i>t</i>
5.	119 <i>i</i>
9.	136 <i>d</i> , N.
18.	21 <i>c</i> , 97 <i>h</i>
19.	20 <i>f</i>
22.	128 <i>c</i>
23.	75 <i>u</i>
24.	10 <i>g</i> , 103 <i>m</i>
69, 4.	118 <i>p</i>
5.	131 <i>q</i> , N. 3
9.	48 <i>i</i>
10.	95 <i>b</i> , N. 1
11.	144 <i>l</i> , N. 3
24.	64 <i>h</i>
33.	69 <i>s</i>
71, 23.	44 <i>o</i>
72, 2.	107 <i>n</i>
14.	69 <i>b</i>
17.	10 <i>g</i>
20.	52 <i>q</i>
73, 2.	75 <i>u</i>
7.	145 <i>o</i>
9.	63 <i>n</i> , 69 <i>x</i>
14.	123 <i>c</i>
16.	49 <i>e</i> , 108 <i>e</i>
17.	108 <i>h</i>
20.	53 <i>q</i> , 119 <i>y</i> , N. 1
27.	119 <i>ff</i>
28.	73 <i>d</i>
74, 7.	119 <i>gg</i>
8.	76 <i>f</i>
10.	64 <i>e</i>
19.	80 <i>f</i>
75, 4.	146 <i>g</i>
76, 6.	54 <i>a</i> , N.
11.	124 <i>e</i>
77, 2.	63 <i>o</i>
4.	75 <i>l</i> , 75 <i>u</i>
10.	67 <i>r</i>
11.	67 <i>r</i>

Psalm

77, 16	. . . 20g, 125c
18	. . . 55b, 93bb
20	. . . 20h
78, 6	. . . 107h
15	. . . 132h, N. 2
16	. . . 74l
44	. . . 75u
54	. . . 138g
80, 8	. . . 131s
11	. . . 52q, 121d
14	. . . 5m, 56
19	. . . 72t
81, 9	. . . 109b
83, 12	. . . 131o
19	. . . 144l, N. 2
86, 2	. . . 9v, 48i, N., 61f, N.
87, 3	. . . 121d, N. 2
5	. . . 123c
88, 5	. . . 152u
6	. . . 116h
17	. . . 55d
89, 7	. . . 124q
10	. . . 76b
40	. . . 64e
48	. . . 135f
52	. . . 20h
90, 2	. . . 107c
3	. . . 109k, 111t
4	. . . 118r
5	. . . 155g
6	. . . 112m
8	. . . 73d
10	. . . 49e
13	. . . 147c
15	. . . 87n, 130d
91, 4	. . . 67p, 109k
6	. . . 67q, 118i
9	. . . 117ii
11	. . . 20c
12	. . . 60e
92, 12	. . . 132b
93, 5	. . . 75kk
94, 1	. . . 53m, 69v
9	. . . 93qq
12	. . . 20g
20	. . . 60b, 63m
99, 6	. . . 74i, 75oo
100, 3	. . . 103g
101, 5	. . . 55b, 64i, 90m
102, 4	. . . 67u
9	. . . 116i
14	. . . 67cc
19	. . . 106e
28	. . . 67g, p. 459, N.
103, 1	. . . 10g
3	. . . 91e, 91l
4	. . . 58g
5	. . . 145k, 156d
9	. . . 117g

Psalm

104, 1	. . . 106g
3	. . . 20m, N. 2, 35b, 126b
8	. . . 138g
11	. . . 90n
12	. . . 93s
18	. . . 20m, 126x
20	. . . 109h, 159d
21	. . . 114p
25	. . . 136d, N.
26	. . . 138g
28	. . . 47m, 159c
105, 12	. . . 118x
28	. . . 53n
43	. . . 78l
107, 23	. . . 5n
43	. . . 93m
109, 2	. . . 117t
3	. . . 57, N. 3
10	. . . 64e
13	. . . 75y
110, 1	. . . 164f
2	. . . 110c
3	. . . 141c
4	. . . 90l
111, 1	. . . 5h
112, 1	. . . 5h
8	. . . 164f
9	. . . 120g
113, 5	. . . 90l
114, 1	. . . 128a, N. 2
8	. . . 90m, 90n
115, 7	. . . 143d, 147e
116, 4	. . . 16f
6	. . . 53q
7	. . . 72s, 91l
12	. . . 91l
15	. . . 90f
118, 5	. . . 20g, 59f, 119gg
7	. . . 119i
10	. . . 60d
13	. . . 113p
14	. . . 80g
18	. . . 20g
23	. . . 74g
25	. . . 53m
26	. . . 59e
119, 1	. . . 5n, 75oo
18	. . . 75cc
28	. . . 91n
117	. . . 75l
128	. . . 130f, N.
136	. . . 155n
137	. . . 145r
120, 1	. . . 90g, 127e
5	. . . 117bb
6	. . . 119s
7	. . . 141c, N. 4
121, 1	. . . 127e
3	. . . 107p, 109e

Psalm

121, 5	. . . 124k
122, 6	. . . 75u
123, 1	. . . 90m
4	. . . 127g
124, 4	. . . 90f
126, 6	. . . 113p, 113n
127, 1	. . . 118i
2	. . . 23l, 80h, 114m
128, 3	. . . 75v, 96
5	. . . 110i
132, 4	. . . 80g
12	. . . 34b, 91n, 138g
135, 7	. . . 53o
136, 1	. . . 2s
6	. . . 65d
137, 3	. . . 117gg
5	. . . 159m
6	. . . 58g
7	. . . 75cc, 116d
138, 2	. . . 16f
6	. . . 69b, N., 69p
139, 1	. . . 59k
2	. . . 73a, N. 1
5	. . . 91e
8	. . . 66e, 159m
11	. . . 103d, 111x, 159f
14	. . . 75qq, 118p
18	. . . 159c, N.
20	. . . 23i, 68h, 75oo
21	. . . 72cc
22	. . . 117g, 128r
140, 1	. . . 91l
10	. . . 75mm
13	. . . 44i
141, 3	. . . 20k, 48i
4	. . . 96
5	. . . 74k
8	. . . 75bb
142, 5	. . . 113bb
143, 6	. . . 106g
144, 2	. . . 87f
14	. . . 122e
145, 1	. . . 5k
7	. . . 132b
13	. . . 123c
147, 1	. . . 52p
2	. . . 20m
149, 2	. . . 124k

Proverbs

1, 10	. . . 68k, 75k
16	. . . 145u
19	. . . 29f
20	. . . 47k, 48d, 86l, 124e
21	. . . 75v
22	. . . 63m
28	. . . 60e
2, 10	. . . 145u

Proverbs

2, 11	58 <i>i</i>
14	128 <i>w</i>
19	116 <i>i</i>
22	144 <i>g</i>
3, 3	110 <i>f</i>
8	22 <i>s</i>
12	16 <i>b</i>
25	109 <i>e</i>
26	119 <i>i</i>
4, 4	75 <i>n</i>
8	60 <i>f</i>
13	20 <i>h</i>
21	72 <i>ee</i>
25	70 <i>b</i>
5, 2	145 <i>u</i>
496
13	75 <i>ee</i>
17	152 <i>o</i>
22	60 <i>c</i> , 131 <i>m</i> , N. 3	
6, 24	128 <i>w</i>
7, 2	75 <i>n</i>
7	108 <i>h</i>
8	91 <i>e</i>
11	94 <i>d</i>
13	67 <i>dd</i> , 68 <i>e</i>
8, 3	47 <i>k</i> , 48 <i>d</i>
496
17	68 <i>f</i>
20	122 <i>f</i>
22	59 <i>f</i>
26	124 <i>l</i>
27	67 <i>r</i>
28	93 <i>v</i>
32	155 <i>n</i>
9, 1	86 <i>l</i>
5	119 <i>m</i>
10	124 <i>h</i>
12	159 <i>ff</i>
13	152 <i>u</i> , N. 2
18	116 <i>l</i>
10, 4	23 <i>g</i> , 72 <i>p</i> , 117 <i>t</i>	
26	124 <i>h</i>
11, 3	67 <i>n</i>
21	22 <i>s</i>
25	69 <i>w</i>
12, 1	16 <i>f</i>
10	145 <i>h</i>
18	75 <i>qq</i>
19	108 <i>h</i>
28	152 <i>g</i>
13, 4	131 <i>n</i>
10	144 <i>b</i>
20	117 <i>c</i>
23	23 <i>g</i>
24	131 <i>m</i>
14, 1	86 <i>l</i> , p. 4 ⁸⁹ , N. 1	
2	116 <i>k</i>
3	47 <i>g</i>
7	152 <i>u</i> , N. 2
10	22 <i>s</i>

Proverbs

14, 13	131 <i>n</i> , N. 1
14	72 <i>p</i>
20	121 <i>f</i>
30	124 <i>d</i>
34	72 <i>bb</i>
15, 1	20 <i>c</i> , 22 <i>s</i>
5	63 <i>n</i>
13	20 <i>h</i>
20	107 <i>f</i>
16, 4	127 <i>i</i>
11	128 <i>a</i> , N. 1
17, 2	73 <i>ee</i>
4	68 <i>i</i>
10	66 <i>f</i>
12	113 <i>cc</i> , 133 <i>b</i> , N. 3,	
		152 <i>g</i>
18, 16	92 <i>g</i>
22	159 <i>h</i>
24	47 <i>b</i>
19, 2	75 <i>oo</i>
7	9 <i>u</i>
25	63 <i>m</i> , 69 <i>v</i>
20, 2	128 <i>h</i>
9	107 <i>t</i>
10	123 <i>f</i>
13	110 <i>h</i>
22	22 <i>s</i>
21, 6	128 <i>c</i>
12	125 <i>c</i>
22, 21	10 <i>k</i> , 124 <i>k</i> , 131 <i>c</i>	
23, 1	73 <i>a</i> , 73 <i>d</i>
21	93 <i>p</i>
22	138 <i>g</i>
24	159 <i>i</i>
29	131 <i>q</i>
24, 4	29 <i>o</i>
14	48 <i>l</i>
17	51 <i>l</i>
31	117 <i>z</i>
25, 2	53 <i>k</i>
5	126 <i>n</i>
11	93 <i>r</i>
12	161 <i>a</i> , N.
13	124 <i>k</i>
16	76 <i>k</i>
17	69 <i>v</i>
19	52 <i>s</i> , 67 <i>s</i> , 92 <i>g</i>	
27	113 <i>b</i>
26, 7	75 <i>u</i>
17	155 <i>e</i>
23	145 <i>u</i>
27, 6	63 <i>c</i>
9	146 <i>e</i>
15	75 <i>x</i>
24	150 <i>g</i> , N. 1
25	20 <i>h</i>
28, 6	88 <i>e</i> , N. 2
22	10 <i>h</i>
29, 6	67 <i>q</i>
30, 196

Proverbs

30, 3	124 <i>h</i>
6	10 <i>k</i> , 69 <i>v</i>
17	10 <i>g</i> , 24 <i>e</i>
18	134 <i>s</i>
24	133 <i>g</i>
28	144 <i>h</i>
30	152 <i>b</i>
31	35 <i>m</i>
31, 2	37 <i>f</i>
3	53 <i>g</i> , 87 <i>e</i>
4	75 <i>n</i>
10	2 <i>s</i> , 5 <i>h</i>

Job

1, 1	112 <i>h</i> , 156 <i>b</i>
3	123 <i>a</i>
4	97 <i>c</i> , 112 <i>dd</i>
5	107 <i>e</i> , 112 <i>f</i> , 118 <i>h</i>	
6	119 <i>cc</i> , 126 <i>s</i> , 155 <i>e</i>	
7	107 <i>h</i>
12	136 <i>d</i>
14	116 <i>r</i> , 119 <i>cc</i> , 122 <i>c</i> ,	
		135 <i>e</i> , 141 <i>i</i> , 145 <i>c</i>
15	49 <i>e</i> , 122 <i>e</i> , 135 <i>o</i>	
16	116 <i>u</i> , 164 <i>a</i>
18	116 <i>u</i>
19	122 <i>g</i>
21	33 <i>f</i> , 74 <i>k</i> , 118 <i>n</i>	
2, 3	111 <i>l</i>
9	110 <i>f</i> , 150 <i>b</i>
10	150 <i>a</i> , 153
8, 2	68 <i>e</i>
3	29 <i>e</i> , 68 <i>d</i> , 107 <i>b</i> ,	
		107 <i>k</i> , 155 <i>i</i> , 155 <i>f</i>
4	141 <i>c</i> , N. 3
6	75 <i>r</i>
8	114 <i>m</i>
9	109 <i>a</i> , N., 152 <i>k</i>	
11	152 <i>z</i>
13	106 <i>p</i> , 159 <i>dd</i>
15	155 <i>e</i>
17	106 <i>l</i>
19	p. 459, N.
20	128 <i>y</i>
24	145 <i>p</i>
25	75 <i>n</i>
4, 2	28 <i>b</i> , 87 <i>e</i> , 150 <i>m</i>	
3	107 <i>e</i> , 132 <i>f</i>
5	111 <i>t</i> , 144 <i>b</i>
6	143 <i>d</i>
7	136 <i>c</i>
17	107 <i>f</i> , 133 <i>b</i> , N. 3,	
		150 <i>h</i>
19	144 <i>g</i>
20	29 <i>l</i> , 67 <i>g</i> , 67 <i>y</i>
21	50 <i>m</i>
5, 2	117 <i>n</i>
3	135 <i>a</i>
5	119 <i>e</i>

Job	Job	Job
5, 7 . . . 128 v, 161 a	9, 29 . . . 107 n	15, 11 . . . 133 c
8 . . . 107 x	32 . 116 s, 152 d, 166 a	13 . . . 125 c
10 . . . 126 b	33 . . . 109 i, 152 d	15 . . . 67 ac
13 . . . 91 e	34 . . . 60 d	16 . . . 116 e
14 . . . 118 m	10, 1 . . . 72 dd	17 . 75 bb, 138 h, 143 d
16 . . . 90 g	7 . . . 119 aa, N. 3	19 . . . 134 s
18 . . . 75 qg	8 . . . 111 e	20 . . . 146 a
22 . . . 109 e	15 . . . 159 ff	21 . . . 118 e
24 . . . 159 g	16 . . . 109 h, 120 g	22 . . . 75 w, 147 c
27 . . . 20 g	17 . . . 154 a, N.	18, 3 . . . 150 g
6, 2 . . . 113 w, 144 g	18 . . . 107 n	4 . 103 l, 108 f, 119 q
5 . . . 150 h	19 . . . 107 n	5 . . . 60 f
7 . . . 66 b, 106 g	22 . . . 90 g, 152 a, N.	6 . 63 f, 108 e, 159 ff
8 . . . 95 h, 151 d	11, 2 . . . 128 t	7 . 53 p, 75 ac, 144 p
9 . . . 120 d	3 . . . 111 m	8 . . . 156 e
12 . . . 141 d, 150 f	5 . . . 151 b	9 . . . 118 q, 119 q
13 . . . 150 g, N. 1	6 . 110 i, 134 r, N. 2	10 . . . 54 k, 119 q
14 . . . 154 a, N.	9 . . . 91 e	12 . . . 112 ll
16 . . . 126 d	11 . . . 128 t	13 . . . 95 k
17 . . . 130 d, 155 l	12 . 51 g, 131 c, N. 2	14 . . . 126 p
19 . . . 119 s	15 . . . 119 w, 159 ee	16 . . . 44 m, 55 e
20 . . . 135 p, 145 w	17 . 48 d, 108 e, 133 e,	17 . 152 a, N., 160 c
21 . . . 75 t, 152 a	144 c	19 . . . 124 b
22 . . 22 p, 64 a, 69 o	20 . . . 103 m	20 . . . 69 x
25 . . . 154 a	12, 3 . . . 152 d	22 . . . 75 m, 145 m
26 . . . 65 f, 69 v	4 . . . 111 m	17, 1 . . . 124 c
28 . . . 120 g	6 . 29 t, 75 m, 124 e	2 . . . 20 h, 75 ff
7, 2 . . . 155 g	7 . . . 145 k	4 . . . 72 cc
3 . . . 121 c, 144 g	11 . . . 135 i, 161 a	5 . . . 75 w
4 . . . 124 f	12 . . . 141 d	7 . . . 75 p
6 . . . 133 b	14 . . . 159 w	10 . 10 h, 120 e, 135 r
13 . . . 112 h, 119 m	17 . 116 s, 116 x, 118 o	13 . . . 124 b
14 . . . 58 i, 60 d	23 . . . 117 n	16 . . . 47 k
15 . . . 133 b	24 . . . 128 a, 152 n	18, 2 . . . 130 a
18 . . . 123 c	18, 3 . . . 53 h, 113 d	3 . . . 75 qg
20 . 102 l, 119 aa, 159 h	4 . . . 151 b	4 . . . 51 m, 139 f
21 . . . 37 f	7 . . . 150 h	7 . . . 67 dd, 135
8, 5 . . . 159 r	9 . . . 53 k	8 . . . 54 k
7 . . . 145 w	13 . . 119 ff, 137 c	12 . . . 109 k
9 . . . 141 d	15 . . . 153	18 . . . 144 g
10 . . . 125 c	16 . . . 152 e	21 . . . 130 d
11 . 75 rr, 150 h, 152 a, N.	17 . . . 113 r	10, 2 . 21 d, 60 e, 75 gg
12 . . . 155 l	19 . . . 155 f	3 . . . 53 m, 120 c
14 . . . 72 r, 93 oo	21 . 29 q, 60 d, 64 h	7 . . . 63 k, N.
18 . . . 29 g, 64 g	25 . . . 117 c	10 . . . 69 p
19 . . . 145 d	27 . . . 54 f, 93 r	15 . . . 60 a
21 . . . 23 e, 75 pp	28 . . 144 p, 155 h	17 . . . 67 ea, 69 x
9, 6 . . . 54 k	14, 1 . . . 116 l	18 . . . 159 e
7 . . . 109 g, 165 a	2 . . . 111 s	19 . . . 138 h
8 . . . 87 s	3 . . . 150 b, 153	23 . 53 m, 67 y, 126 i,
11 . . . 117 n	6 . . . 156 g	151 d
15 . 55 b, 159 n, 160 a	9 . . . 65 e, 112 m	24 . . . 51 m
16 . . . 111 x	10 . . . 111 t	25 . . . 118 n
18 . . . 20 h, 114 m	11 . . . 161 a	26 . . . 119 w, 144 g
19 . . . 147 b	19 . . . 145 k	28 . . . 117 n
20 . . . 53 n, 107 x	22 . . . 153	20, 4 . . . 150 e
22 . . . 106 i	15, 3 . . 113 h, 119 h, h	9 . . . 122 l
24 . . . 150 l, N. 1	6 . . . 145 m	10 . . . 72 k
26 . . 155 g, 161 a, N.	7 . . . 121 d	11 . . . 145 k
27 . . . 159 u	10 . . . 131 q	12 . . . 159 q

Job

20, 17 . . . 109 *e*, 130 *e*
 19 . . . 154 *a*, N.
 22 . . . 74 *h*, 118 *e*
 23 . . . 103 *f*, N. 3
 24 . . . 159 *c*
 26 . 68 *f*, 145 *u*, 156 *f*
 29 . 131 *b*, 135 *m*
 21, 4 . 100 *n*, 135 *f*,
 143 *a*, 150 *g*
 5 . . . 67 *v*
 7 . . . 117 *s*
 9 . 119 *w*, 141 *c*, N. 4
 11 . . . 52 *n*
 13 . . . 20 *i*, 66 *f*
 16 . 20 *f*, 106 *n*, N. 2
 17 . . . 150 *h*
 21 . . . 37 *d*, 146 *a*
 22 . . . 142 *d*
 23 . . . 139 *g*
 25 . . . 119 *m*
 27 . . . 155 *k*
 29 . . . 44 *d*, 64 *f*
 32 . . . 124 *c*
 22, 2 . . . 103 *f*, N. 3
 3 . . . 67 *y*
 7 . . . 152 *e*
 9 . . . 121 *b*
 12 . 20 *i*, 117 *h*, 141 *c*,
 158 *a*
 16 . . . 121 *d*, 149 *a*
 18 . . . 106 *n*, N. 2
 20 . . . 91 *f*, 149 *e*
 21 . 48 *d*, 110 *f*, 135 *p*
 23 . . . 159 *ff*
 29 . . . 23 *f*
 30 . . . 152 *q*
 23, 2 . . . 119 *aa*
 3 . . . 120 *e*
 6 . . . 100 *l*
 9 . . . 109 *k*
 11 . . . 76 *c*
 12 . . . 143 *d*
 13 . . . 119 *i*
 16 . . . 67 *v*
 17 . . . 155 *h*
 24, 1 . . . 75 *m*, 121 *f*
 5 . . . 118 *r*, 145 *m*
 10 . . . 118 *o*, 152 *u*
 14 . 109 *k*, 118 *x*, 120 *c*
 19 . . . 161 *a*
 21 . . . 70 *d*
 22 . . . 87 *e*, 156 *f*
 23 . . . 91 *l*
 24 . 51 *m*, 67 *m*, 67 *y*
 25 . 150 *l*, N. 1, 152 *a*
 25, 2 . . . 116 *s*
 3 . . . 91 *d*
 5 . . . 67 *ae*
 26, 2 . 152 *a*, N., 152 *u*,
 152 *v*

Job

26, 4 . . . 117 *gg*
 5 . . . 119 *c*
 7 . . . 116 *s*
 9 . . . 56
 14 . . . 119 *m*
 27, 3 . . . 128 *e*
 5 . . . 149 *a*
 6 . . . 119 *w*, N. 2
 7 . . . 118 *x*
 12 . . . 113 *w*
 19 . 68 *h*, 120 *d*, N. 2
 23 . . . 103 *f*, N. 3
 28, 1 . . . 155 *h*
 2 . . . 121 *d*, 127 *ii*
 4 . . . 121 *f*, 126 *b*
 5 . . . 118 *w*
 6 . . . 124 *l*
 11 . . . 119 *x*
 12 . . . 119 *ff*
 17 . . . 152 *s*
 25 . . . 114 *r*
 27 . . . 60 *d*
 29, 2 . 118 *u*, 130 *d*, 151 *b*
 3 . 67 *p*, 118 *h*, 131 *o*
 6 . . . 23 *f*
 8 . . . 120 *g*, N. 2
 10 . . . 44 *c*, 146 *a*
 12 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *n*
 15 . . . 141 *d*
 16 . . . 130 *d*, 155 *n*
 21 . . . 20 *i*, 24 *e*, 67 *g*
 23 . . . 118 *w*
 25 . . . 10 *g*
 30, 3 . . . 126 *b*, 133 *l*
 6 . . . 114 *k*, 133 *h*
 10 . . . 106 *g*
 13 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *n*
 14 . . . 75 *n*
 15 . . . 121 *b*
 19 . . . 59 *f*, 75 *ll*
 20 . . . 72 *bb*
 26 . . . 49 *e*, 108 *e*
 28 . . . 118 *n*, 156 *e*
 31, 1 . . . 148 *a*
 5 . . . 72 *ff*
 7 . . . 23 *c*, 108 *f*
 9 . . . 159 *m*
 10 . . . 87 *e*
 11 . . . 32 *l*, 131 *s*
 12 . . . 155 *f*
 15 . . . 58 *k*, 72 *cc*
 18 . 117 *x*, 126 *p*, 163 *h*
 22 . . . 91 *e*
 26 . 67 *p*, 111 *g*, 118 *n*,
 118 *q*
 27 . . . 75 *g*
 28 . . . 159 *dd*
 29 . . . 112 *e*
 31 . . . 151 *b*
 34 . . . 156 *f*

Job

31, 35 . . . 151 *b*
 32, 6 . . . 68 *e*, 69 *m*
 7 . . . 146 *a*
 11 . . . 68 *i*
 12 . . . 103 *o*
 17 . . . 63 *f*
 18 . . . 23 *f*, 74 *k*
 22 . . . 120 *c*
 38, 4 . . . 16 *h*, 75 *mm*
 5 . . . 48 *i*, 54 *k*
 21 . . . 14 *d*, 64 *e*
 25 . . . 56
 30 . . . 51 *l*, 72 *v*
 34, 13 . . . 90 *f*
 18 . . . 113 *ae*, N. 4
 22 . . . 115 *g*
 36 . . . 159 *cc*
 38, 10 . . . 124 *k*
 11 . . . 68 *k*
 15 . . . 152 *k*
 38, 2 . . . 65 *e*
 7 . . . 111 *b*, N. 2
 32 . . . 122 *o*
 36 . . . 143 *d*
 37, 5 . . . 118 *p*
 6 . . . 75 *hh*
 12 . . . 90 *f*
 14 . . . 117 *w*
 16 . . . 124 *e*
 18 . . . 150 *h*
 24 . . . 59 *i*
 38, 2 . . . 136 *c*
 3 . . . 126 *p*
 5 . . . 159 *dd*
 6 . . . 137 *b*
 7 . . . 67 *n*
 12 . . . 119 *w*, N. 2
 13 . . . 5 *n*, 114 *r*
 14 . . . 118 *w*, 134 *r*
 16 . . . 150 *k*
 18 . . . 122 *g*, 150 *b*
 19 . . . 155 *k*
 21 . . . 107 *c*, 146 *a*
 24 . . . 165 *a*
 26 . . . 152 *u*, 155 *e*
 27 . . . 133 *l*
 28 . . . 150 *g*
 30 . . . 118 *w*
 32 . . . 145 *m*
 39, 1 . . . 64 *d*
 2 . . . 91 *f*, 150 *b*
 3 . . . 135 *o*
 9 . . . 22 *s*
 13 . . . 150 *f*
 15 . . . 135 *p*
 17 . . . 119 *m*
 24 . . . 75 *oo*
 26 . . . 53 *n*
 30 . . . 55 *f*
 40, 2 . . . 113 *ae*, 113 *gg*

Job

40, 5 134 r, 134 s
8 150 g
19	. 116 g, N. 2, 127 i
22 67 n
24 66 f
30 150 b
32 69 v
41, 1 93 ss
2 72 cc
4 103 g
7 118 r
12 154 a, N.
15 156 g
17 76 b
20 128 v
22 133 k
25	. 24 b, 75 v, 126 b
26	. 16 f, 117 a, N. 1
42, 2 44 i
3 133 d, 156 f
5 75 mm
7 164 d
8 163 d
10 91 k
13 80 k, 97 c
15 135 o, 145 o

Song of Solomon

1, 1 133 i
6 60 a, 75 x
7 36, 75 v
8 20 k
10 73 g
15 141 d
2, 2 10 k
3 129 d
7 144 a
9 75 q
12 85 u, N. 1
14 69 v, 93 ss
17 119 s
3, 7 131 n
8 50 f
11 75 n
15 69 o
4, 1 69 p, 72 t
5, 5 135 b
9 59 k
16 85 s, N.
6, 8 32 n
11 67 dd
7, 2 93 x
10 133 k
8, 2	. 87 f, 131 c, N. 2
5 59 g, N.
6 93 m
10 74 i
14 119 s

Ruth

1, 1 49 b, N. 2
3 51 m
8 135 o, 144 a
9	. 46 f, 74 k, 74 k, 110 i
12 106 p, 107 x
13	. 103 f, N. 4, 152 g
14 76 b
19 91 f
20 46 f, 80 k
21 118 n
22 32 n, 138 k
2, 6 138 k
8 47 g, 47 o
9 112 k
14	. . 53 n, 66 c, 103 g
15 35 k
16 67 o
21 47 o, 122 g
3, 2 91 f
3	. 44 k, 104 g, 141 c
4	. 47 o, 109 k, 112 s
6 59 g
14 107 c
15 64 c, 134 n
18	. . 163 c, 163 c, N.
4, 3	. . . 129 k, 138 k
4	. . 29 s, N., 152 o
7 112 k
15 59 g

Lamentations

1, 1 5 k, 90 l
4 69 t, 87 e
8	. 67 y, 72 ee, 117 p
10 120 c, 155 f
14 130 d, 155 n
16	. 75 v, 117 s, 135 f
18 50 e
19 107 q, 165 a
2, 7 64 e
11 51 l
16 15 c
18 80 f
3, 1 144 p
5 53 n
12 80 k
14 87 f
22 20 o
26 107 q
33 69 m
48	. 29 q, 69 p, 117 s
50 109 k
53 69 u
4, 1 54 k, 75 rr
2 75 rr
5 117 n
9 152 p
14 51 k, 120 g

Lamentations

4, 17 100 o
5, 5 72 ee, N.
10 145 u

Ecclesiastes

1, 1 122 r
4 116 i
9 137 c
12 133 s
13 p. 353, N.
16 135 b
17 8 s
2, 1 135 b
5 p. 353, N.
7 145 u
8 122 v
13 24 e, 133 b
15 93 rr, 135 e
20 64 e
21 131 m
22 36
26 75 oo
3, 2 2 s
4 114 b
10 131 n
11 152 y
14 165 b
15 114 i
18 36, 67 p
19 93 rr
21	. 100 m, 150 i, N. 4
22 102 k
4, 2 113 gg
3 117 l
10 124 o
14 35 d
17 133 c
5, 5 53 q
7 124 k
8 32 l
11 69 n
14 109 i
15 161 b
16 147 e
18 p. 353, N., 141 k
7, 7 117 c
16	. . 54 c, 54 k, 131 q
24 133 k
26 75 oo
27 122 r
8, 1 75 rr
10	. 54 g, 119 ii, 128 w, N.
9, 4 143 e
12 52 s
14 p. 353, N.
10, 5 75 gg, 155 k
17 91 l
20 53 n

Ecclesiastes

11, 2	134 s
3	23 i, 75 s
12, 1	124 k
4	72 t, 128 v
5	73 g
6	67 g, 67 t
7	109 k
10	145 k

Esther

1, 4	93 ww
5	74 k
8	123 c
17	93 m
2, 3	117 d
9	75 v
11	123 c
3, 4	157 c
4, 2	114 l
8	93 ww
6, 13	20 g
7, 2	109 f
5	74 g
8	114 i
8, 8	63 c
9, 1	p. 459, N.
7	2 s
23	124 e, 145 o, N. 1

Daniel

1, 4	23 c, 128 a, N. 1
10	93 ss
12	75 cc
13	75 hh
15	93 ss
2, 4	1 c
8, 3	93 n
11	72 ee
13	125 b, 126 s, 127 f
22	47 k, 87 i, 95 u, 116 w
9, 5	91 n
13	117 m
19	48 i
11, 6	127 i, 139 k
23	53 l, 54 k
35	53 g
12, 2	102 b, 124 e
7	93 aa, N.
11	134 g
13	87 e

Ezra

2, 62	131 r
69	97 g
3, 3	124 g
6	134 p

Ezra

3, 12	126 aa
4, 7	55 k
8	1 c
6, 21	8 k
7, 12	1 c
28	49 e
8, 1	64 i
2	74 l
11	105 a
18	14 d
23	51 n
25	93 oo, 138 i
29	127 g
30	92 g
36	112 rr
9, 6	22 s
10, 13	141 d
14	127 i, 138 i
16	45 g
17	127 c, N.

Nehemiah

2, 3	67 dd
7	68 g
12	131 e
13	5 n
8, 8	124 o
13	35 d
4, 3	49 e, N. 3, 53 n
4	119 m
7	20 k
9	49 e, N. 3, 67 x
12	116 k, N.
5, 14	91 e
6, 8	23 c, 74 i
10	144 i
11	100 m
7, 2	118 x
64	64 i
66	23 i
8, 8	2 f
10	85 g, N., 128 p, 152 v, 155 n
9, 13	132 d
35	126 x
10, 37	123 a, N.
39	53 k
11, 17	53 g
12, 44	95 n
47	95 n
13, 9	165 a
13	53 g, 53 n
16	9 b
21	73 f
24	2 a, 2 w

1 Chronicles

2, 13	47 b
-----------------	------

1 Chronicles

2, 30	152 u
48	145 u
3, 5	69 t
4, 10	61 a, 167 a
5, 2	141 a
20	63 c
7, 5	124 g
8, 8	52 o
38	29 g
9, 13	128 c
22	p. 459, N.
25	134 m
27	123 c
10, 2	53 r
11, 39	23 f
12, 2	24 f, N. 1, 70 b
8	114 o
17	61 c
23	155 d
33	123 f
38	23 f
15, 8	127 f
12	155 n
19	131 a
24	53 o, 55 e
26	63 i
27	56, 127 g
18, 8	2 s
20, 8	69 t
21, 1	125 f
17	141 k, N. 2
22, 7	143 a, N. 3
23, 6	63 n
24, 3	63 n
26, 28	138 i
27, 12	127 d
28, 2	143 a, N. 3
11	96
29, 1	155 d
3	155 n
33	65 f

2 Chronicles

1, 4	138 i, 155 n
4, 3	123 a, N.
8, 18	93 r
16, 4	125 k
9	155 n
12	75 rr
14	124 c
17, 11	93 x
20, 1	102 b
22	155 l
34	63 p
35	54 a, N.
21, 4	119 w, N. 2
17	133 g
22, 5	35 d
25, 17	156 c, N. 1

Job

40, 5	134 r, 134 s
8	150 g
19	116 g, N. 2, 127 i
22	67 n
24	66 f
30	150 b
32	69 v
41, 1	93 ss
2	72 cc
4	103 g
7	118 r
12	154 a, N.
15	156 g
17	76 b
20	128 v
22	133 h
25	24 b, 75 v, 126 b
26	16 f, 117 a, N. 1
42, 2	44 i
3	133 d, 156 f
5	75 mm
7	164 d
8	163 d
10	91 k
13	80 k, 97 c
15	135 o, 145 o

Song of Solomon

1, 1	133 i
6	60 a, 75 x
8	36, 75 v
10	73 g
15	141 d
2, 2	10 k
3	129 d
7	144 a
9	75 qg
12	85 u, N. 1
14	69 v, 93 ss
17	119 s
3, 7	131 n
8	50 f
11	75 n
15	69 o
4, 1	69 p, 72 l
5, 5	135 b
9	59 h
16	85 g, N.
6, 8	32 n
11	67 dd
7, 2	93 x
10	133 h
8, 2	87 f, 131 c, N. 2
5	59 g, N.
6	93 m
10	74 i
14	119 s

Ruth

1, 1	49 b, N. 2
3	51 m
8	135 o, 144 a
9	46 f, 74 h, 74 k, 110 i
12	106 p, 107 x
13	103 f, N. 4, 152 g
14	76 b
19	91 f
20	46 f, 80 k
21	118 n
22	32 n, 138 k
2, 6	138 k
8	47 g, 47 o
9	112 h k
14	53 n, 66 c, 103 g
15	35 k
16	67 o
21	47 o, 122 g
8, 2	91 f
3	44 h, 104 g, 141 c
4	47 o, 109 k, 112 s
6	59 g
14	107 c
15	64 c, 134 n
18	163 c, 163 c, N.
4, 3	129 k, 138 k
4	29 i, N., 152 o
7	112 h
15	59 g

Lamentations

1, 1	5 h, 90 l
4	69 t, 87 e
8	67 y, 72 cc, 117 p
10	120 c, 155 f
14	130 d, 155 n
16	75 v, 117 s, 135 f
18	50 e
19	107 q, 165 a
2, 7	64 e
11	51 l
16	15 c
18	80 f
3, 1	144 p
5	53 n
12	80 h
14	87 f
22	20 o
26	107 q
33	69 u
48	29 q, 69 p, 117 s
50	109 k
53	69 u
4, 1	54 k, 75 rr
2	75 rr
5	117 n
9	152 p
14	51 h, 120 g

Lamentations

4, 17	100 o
5, 5	72 cc, N.
10	145 n

Ecclesiastes

1, 1	122 r
4	116 l
9	137 c
12	133 i
13	p. 353, N.
16	135 b
17	86 l
2, 1	135 b
5	p. 353, N.
7	145 u
8	122 v
13	24 e, 133 b
15	93 rr, 135 c
20	64 e
21	131 m
22	36
26	75 oo
8, 2	2 s
4	114 b
10	131 n
11	152 y
14	165 b
15	114 i
18	36, 67 p
19	93 rr
21	100 m, 150 i, N. 4
22	102 k
4, 2	113 gg
3	117 l
10	124 o
14	35 d
17	133 e
5, 5	53 q
7	124 k
8	32 l
11	69 n
14	109 i
15	161 b
16	147 e
18	p. 353, N., 141 k
7, 7	117 c
16	54 c, 54 k, 131 q
24	133 k
26	75 oo
27	122 r
8, 1	75 rr
10	54 g, 119 ii, 128 w, N.
9, 4	143 e
12	52 s
14	p. 353, N.
10, 5	75 gg, 155 k
17	91 l
20	53 n

Ecclesiastes

11, 2	134 <i>s</i>
3	23 <i>i</i> , 75 <i>s</i>
12, 1	124 <i>k</i>
4	72 <i>l</i> , 128 <i>v</i>
5	73 <i>g</i>
6	67 <i>g</i> , 67 <i>t</i>
7	109 <i>k</i>
10	145 <i>h</i>

Esther

1, 4	93 <i>ww</i>
5	74 <i>h</i>
8	123 <i>c</i>
17	93 <i>m</i>
2, 3	117 <i>d</i>
9	75 <i>v</i>
11	123 <i>c</i>
3, 4	157 <i>c</i>
4, 2	114 <i>l</i>
8	93 <i>ww</i>
6, 13	20 <i>g</i>
7, 2	109 <i>f</i>
5	74 <i>g</i>
8	114 <i>i</i>
8, 8	63 <i>c</i>
9, 1	p. 459, N.
7	2 <i>s</i>
23	124 <i>e</i> , 145 <i>o</i> , N. I

Daniel

1, 4	23 <i>c</i> , 128 <i>a</i> , N. I
10	93 <i>ss</i>
12	75 <i>cc</i>
13	75 <i>hh</i>
15	93 <i>ss</i>
2, 4	1 <i>c</i>
8, 3	93 <i>n</i>
11	72 <i>ee</i>
13	125 <i>b</i> , 126 <i>e</i> , 127 <i>f</i>
22	47 <i>k</i> , 87 <i>i</i> , 95 <i>u</i> , 116 <i>w</i>
9, 5	91 <i>n</i>
13	117 <i>m</i>
19	48 <i>i</i>
11, 6	127 <i>i</i> , 139 <i>h</i>
23	53 <i>l</i> , 54 <i>k</i>
35	53 <i>g</i>
12, 2	102 <i>b</i> , 124 <i>e</i>
7	93 <i>aa</i> , N.
11	134 <i>g</i>
13	87 <i>e</i>

Ezra

2, 62	131 <i>r</i>
69	97 <i>g</i>
3, 3	124 <i>g</i>
6	134 <i>p</i>

Ezra

3, 12	126 <i>aa</i>
4, 7	55 <i>k</i>
8	1 <i>c</i>
6, 21	8 <i>k</i>
7, 12	1 <i>c</i>
28	49 <i>e</i>
8, 1	64 <i>i</i>
2	74 <i>l</i>
11	105 <i>a</i>
18	14 <i>d</i>
23	51 <i>n</i>
25	93 <i>oo</i> , 138 <i>i</i>
29	127 <i>g</i>
30	92 <i>g</i>
36	112 <i>rr</i>
9, 6	22 <i>s</i>
10, 13	141 <i>d</i>
14	127 <i>i</i> , 138 <i>i</i>
16	45 <i>g</i>
17	127 <i>c</i> , N.

Nehemiah

2, 3	67 <i>dd</i>
7	68 <i>g</i>
12	131 <i>e</i>
13	5 <i>n</i>
3, 8	124 <i>o</i>
13	35 <i>d</i>
4, 3	49 <i>e</i> , N. 3, 53 <i>n</i>
4	119 <i>m</i>
7	20 <i>h</i>
9	49 <i>e</i> , N. 3, 67 <i>x</i>
12	116 <i>k</i> , N.
5, 14	91 <i>e</i>
6, 8	23 <i>c</i> , 74 <i>i</i>
10	144 <i>i</i>
11	100 <i>m</i>
7, 2	118 <i>x</i>
64	64 <i>i</i>
66	23 <i>i</i>
8, 8	2 <i>t</i>
10	85 <i>g</i> , N., 128 <i>p</i> , 152 <i>v</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
9, 13	132 <i>d</i>
35	126 <i>x</i>
10, 37	123 <i>a</i> , N.
39	53 <i>k</i>
11, 17	53 <i>g</i>
12, 44	95 <i>n</i>
47	95 <i>n</i>
18, 9	165 <i>a</i>
13	53 <i>g</i> , 53 <i>n</i>
16	9 <i>b</i>
21	73 <i>f</i>
24	2 <i>a</i> , 2 <i>w</i>

9, 13	132 <i>d</i>
35	126 <i>x</i>
10, 37	123 <i>a</i> , N.
39	53 <i>k</i>
11, 17	53 <i>g</i>
12, 44	95 <i>n</i>
47	95 <i>n</i>
18, 9	165 <i>a</i>
13	53 <i>g</i> , 53 <i>n</i>
16	9 <i>b</i>
21	73 <i>f</i>
24	2 <i>a</i> , 2 <i>w</i>

1 Chronicles

2, 13	47 <i>b</i>
-----------------	-------------

1 Chronicles

2, 30	152 <i>u</i>
48	145 <i>u</i>
3, 5	69 <i>l</i>
4, 10	61 <i>a</i> , 167 <i>a</i>
5, 2	141 <i>a</i>
20	63 <i>c</i>
7, 5	124 <i>g</i>
8, 8	52 <i>o</i>
38	29 <i>g</i>
9, 13	128 <i>c</i>
22	p. 459, N.
25	134 <i>m</i>
27	123 <i>c</i>
10, 2	53 <i>r</i>
11, 39	23 <i>f</i>
12, 2	24 <i>f</i> , N. 1, 70 <i>b</i>
8	114 <i>o</i>
17	61 <i>c</i>
23	155 <i>d</i>
33	123 <i>f</i>
38	23 <i>f</i>
15, 8	127 <i>f</i>
12	155 <i>n</i>
19	131 <i>a</i>
24	53 <i>o</i> , 55 <i>e</i>
26	63 <i>i</i>
27	56, 127 <i>g</i>
16, 8	2 <i>s</i>
20, 8	69 <i>t</i>
21, 1	125 <i>f</i>
17	141 <i>k</i> , N. 2
22, 7	143 <i>a</i> , N. 3
23, 6	63 <i>n</i>
24, 3	63 <i>n</i>
26, 28	138 <i>i</i>
27, 12	127 <i>d</i>
28, 2	143 <i>a</i> , N. 3
11	96
29, 1	155 <i>d</i>
3	155 <i>n</i>
33	65 <i>f</i>

2 Chronicles

1, 4	138 <i>i</i> , 155 <i>n</i>
4, 3	123 <i>a</i> , N.
8, 18	93 <i>r</i>
16, 4	125 <i>h</i>
9	155 <i>n</i>
12	75 <i>rr</i>
14	124 <i>c</i>
17, 11	93 <i>x</i>
20, 1	102 <i>b</i>
22	155 <i>l</i>
34	63 <i>p</i>
35	54 <i>a</i> , N.
21, 4	119 <i>w</i> , N. 2
17	133 <i>g</i>
22, 5	35 <i>d</i>
25, 17	156 <i>c</i> , N. 1

2 Chronicles

20, 5 114 *c*
 10 22 *s*
 15 . 75 *rr*, 114 *n*,
 126 *s*
 18 114 *l*
 28, 10 . . . 142 *f*, N. 2
 23 53 *o*
 29, 8 138 *i*

2 Chronicles

29, 10 165 *a*
 17 134 *p*
 27 155 *l*
 30, 9 114 *p*
 18 . . . 130 *d*, N. 3
 31, 7 . 69 *n*, 71, 142 *f*,
 N. 2
 10 . . . 121 *d*, N. 2

2 Chronicles

31, 17 117 *m*
 32, 9 101 *a*
 13 8 *k*
 30 69 *m*
 34, 11 16 *f*
 12 10 *k*
 35, 4 93 *ww*
 21 . . . 109 *g*, 135 *g*

OXFORD
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

SELECT LIST OF STANDARD WORKS.

DICTIONARIES	page 1
LAW	" 2
HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.	" 4
PHILOSOPHY, LOGIC, ETC.	" 6
PHYSICAL SCIENCE, ETC.	" 7

1. DICTIONARIES.


A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES,

Founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society.

Imperial 4to.

PRESENT STATE OF THE WORK.

		£	s.	d.
Vol. I.	{ A } Edited by Dr. MURRAY	Half-morocco	2	12 6
	{ B }			
Vol. II.	C Edited by Dr. MURRAY	Half-morocco	2	12 6
Vol. III.	{ D } Edited by Dr. MURRAY and Mr. HENRY BRADLEY			
	{ E }			
	Half-morocco		2	12 6
Vol. IV.	{ F } Edited by { F-Field		0	7 6
	{ G } Mr. BRADLEY { Field-Frankish		0	12 6
		Franklaw-Fyz—G-Gain-coming	0	5 0
Vol. V.	H—K Edited by Dr. MURRAY. H-Haversian		0	5 0

 *The remainder of the work, to the end of the alphabet, is in an advanced state of preparation.*

** * The Dictionary is also, as heretofore, issued in the original Parts:—*

Series I.	Parts I-IX.	A—Distrustful	each	0	12	6
Series I.	Part X.	Distrustfully—Dsiggetai		0	7	6
Series II.	Parts I-III.	E—Frankish	each	0	12	6

Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: HENRY FROWDE, Amen Corner, E.C.

- A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament**, with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the *Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius*, by Francis Brown, D.D., S. R. Driver, D.D., and C. A. Briggs, D.D. Parts I-VI. Small 4to, 2s. 6d. each.
- Thesaurus Syriacus**: collegerunt Quatremère, Bernstein, Lorsche, Arnoldi, Agrell, Field, Roediger: edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.P.
Vol. I, containing Fasciculi I-V, sm. fol., 5l. 5s.
* * *The First Five Fasciculi may also be had separately.*
Fasc. VI. 1l. 1s.; VII. 1l. 11s. 6d.; VIII. 1l. 16s.; IX. 1l. 5s.; X. Pars. I. 1l. 16s.
- A Compendious Syriac Dictionary**, founded upon the above. Edited by Mrs. Margoliouth. Part I. Small 4to, 8s. 6d. net. Part II. *Immediately.*
- A Sanskrit-English Dictionary**. Etymologically and Philologically arranged. By Sir M. Monier-Williams, D.C.L. 4to. 4l. 14s. 6d.
- A Greek-English Lexicon**. By H. G. Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. *Eighth Edition, Revised.* 4to. 1l. 16s.
- An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language**, arranged on an Historical Basis. By W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. *Third Edition.* 4to. 2l. 4s.
- A Middle-English Dictionary**. By F. H. Stratmann. A new edition, by H. Bradley, M.A. 4to, half-morocco, 1l. 11s. 6d.
- The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon**. By H. Sweet, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. Small 4to, 8s. 6d. net.
- An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary**, based on the MS. collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D. Edited and enlarged by Prof. T. N. Toller, M.A. Parts I-III. A-SAX. 4to, stiff covers, 15s. each. Part IV, § 1, SÄR-SWÍÐRIAN. Stiff covers, 8s. 6d. Part IV, § 2, SWÍÐ-SNEL-ÝTMEST, 18s. 6d.
* * *A Supplement, which will complete the Work, is in active preparation.*
- An Icelandic-English Dictionary**, based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfússon, M.A. 4to. 3l. 7s.

2. LAW.

- Anson. Principles of the English Law of Contract, and of Agency in its Relation to Contract.** By Sir W. R. Anson, D.C.L. *Eighth Edition.* With Appendix of American Cases. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- **Law and Custom of the Constitution.** 2 vols. 8vo.
Part I. Parliament. *Third Edition.* 12s. 6d.
Part II. The Crown. *Second Edition.* 14s.

Baden-Powell. Land-Systems of British India; being a Manual of the Land-Tenures, and of the Systems of Land-Revenue Administration prevalent in the several Provinces. By B. H. Baden-Powell, C.I.E. 3 vols. 8vo. 3l. 3s.

Digby. An Introduction to the History of the Law of Real Property. By Kenelm E. Digby, M.A. *Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Grueber. *Lex Aquilia.* By Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hall. *International Law.* By W. E. Hall, M.A. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 22s. 6d.

— *A Treatise on the Foreign Powers and Jurisdiction of the British Crown.* By W. E. Hall, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Holland. *Elements of Jurisprudence.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L. Eighth Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *The European Concert in the Eastern Question; a Collection of Treaties and other Public Acts.* Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by T. E. Holland, D.C.L. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

— *Gentilis, Alberici, De Iure Belli Libri Tres.* Edidit T. E. Holland, I.C.D. Small 4to, half-morocco, 21s.

— *The Institutes of Justinian*, edited as a recension of the Institutes of Gaius, by T. E. Holland, D.C.L. Second Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Holland and Shadwell. *Select Titles from the Digest of Justinian.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L., and C. L. Shadwell, D.C.L. 8vo. 14s.

Also sold in Parts, in paper covers—
Part I. Introductory Titles. 2s. 6d.
Part II. Family Law. 1s.
Part III. Property Law. 2s. 6d.
Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1), 3s. 6d. (No. 2), 4s. 6d.

Ilbert. *The Government of India.* Being a Digest of the Statute Law relating thereto. With Historical Introduction and

Illustrative Documents. By Sir Courtenay Ilbert, K.C.S.I. 8vo, half-roan. 21s.

Markby. *Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence.* By Sir William Markby, D.C.L. Fifth Edition. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Moyle. *Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor; with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation.* By J. B. Moyle, D.C.L. Third Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 16s. Vol. II. 6s.

— *Contract of Sale in the Civil Law.* By J. B. Moyle, D.C.L. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Pollock and Wright. *An Essay on Possession in the Common Law.* By Sir F. Pollock, Bart., M.A., and Sir R. S. Wright, B.C.L. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Poste. *Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius.* With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. Third Edition. 8vo. 18s.

Raleigh. *An Outline of the Law of Property.* By Thos. Raleigh, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Sohm. *Institutes of Roman Law.* By Rudolph Sohm. Translated by J. C. Ledlie, B.C.L. With an Introductory Essay by Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. 8vo. 18s.

Stokes. *The Anglo-Indian Codes.* By Whitley Stokes, LL.D.

Vol. I. Substantive Law. 8vo. 30s.

Vol. II. Adjective Law. 8vo. 35s.

First and Second Supplements to the above, 1887-1891. 8vo. 6s. 6d. Separately, No. 1, 2s. 6d.; No. 2, 4s. 6d.

3. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

Adamnani Vita S. Columbae.

Ed. J. T. Fowler, D.C.L. Crown 8vo, half-bound, 8s. 6d. net (with translation, 9s. 6d. net).

Aubrey. 'Brief Lives,' chiefly

of Contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the Years 1669 and 1696. Edited from the Author's MSS., by ANDREW CLARK, M.A., LL.D. With Facsimiles. 2 vols. 8vo. 25s.

Basdae Historia Ecclesiastica,

etc. Edited by C. Plummer, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 21s. net.

Bedford (W.K.R.). The Blazon

of Episcopacy. Being the Arms borne by, or attributed to, the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales. With an Ordinary of the Coats described and of other Episcopal Arms. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. With One Thousand Illustrations. Sm. 4to, buckram, 31s. 6d. net.

Boswell's Life of Samuel

Johnson, LL.D. Edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. In six volumes, medium 8vo. With Portraits and Facsimiles. Half-bound, 3l. 3s.

Bright. Chapters of Early

English Church History. By W. Bright, D.D. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. With a Map. 8vo. 12s.

Casaubon (Isaac). 1559-1614.

By Mark Pattison. 8vo. 16s.

Clarendon's History of the

Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Re-edited from a fresh collation of the original MS. in the Bodleian Library, with marginal dates and occasional notes, by W. Dunn Macray, M.A., F.S.A. 6 vols. Crown 8vo. 2l. 5s.

Dubois and Beauchamp.

Hindu Manners, Customs, and Cere-

monies. By the Abbé J. A. DUBOIS.

Translated from the Author's later French MS. and Edited by HENRY K. BEAUCHAMP. With Prefatory Note by the Right Hon. F. MAX MÜLLER, and Portrait. 8vo, 15s. net.

Earle. Handbook to the Land-

Charters, and other Saxon Documents. By John Earle, M.A. Crown 8vo. 16s.

Freeman. The History of

Sicily from the Earliest Times.

Vols. I. and II. 8vo, cloth, 2l. 2s.

Vol. III. The Athenian and Carthaginian Invasions. 24s.

Vol. IV. From the Tyranny of Dionysios to the Death of Agathoklés. Edited by Arthur J. Evans, M.A. 21s.

Freeman. The Reign of

William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First. By E. A. Freeman, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Gardiner. The Constitutional

Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1628-1660. Selected and Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, M.A. Crown 8vo. 9s.

Gross. The Gild Merchant;

a Contribution to British Municipal History. By Charles Gross, Ph.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

Hastings. Hastings and the

Rohilla War. By Sir John Strachey, G.C.S.I. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

Hill. Sources for Greek

History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. Collected and arranged by G. F. Hill, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hodgkin. Italy and her In-

vaders. With Plates and Maps. By T. Hodgkin, D.C.L.

Vols. I-II. Second Edition. 2l. 2s.

Vols. III-IV. Second Edition. 1l. 16s.

Vols. V-VI. 1l. 16s.

Jackson. *The Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford.* By T. G. Jackson, M.A., R.A. With Twenty-four full-page Illustrations, and numerous Cuts in the Text. Demy 4to, half-bound, 36s. net; or in vellum, gilt top and morocco labels, &c., 42s. net.

Johnson. *Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Collected and Edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. 2 vols. half-roan, 28s.

— *Johnsonian Miscellanies.* By the same Editor. 2 vols. Medium 8vo, half-roan, 28s.

Kitchin. *A History of France.* With Numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D. In three Volumes. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, each 10s. 6d.
Vol. I. to 1453. Vol. II. 1453-1624. Vol. III. 1624-1793.

Lewis (Sir G. Cornwall). *An Essay on the Government of Dependencies.* Edited by C. P. Lucas, B.A. 8vo, half-roan. 14s.

Lucas. *Introduction to a Historical Geography of the British Colonies.* By C. P. Lucas, B.A. With Eight Maps. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

— *Historical Geography of the British Colonies:*

Vol. I. *The Mediterranean and Eastern Colonies (exclusive of India).* With Eleven Maps. Crown 8vo. 5s.

Vol. II. *The West Indian Colonies.* With Twelve Maps. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Vol. III. *West Africa.* With Five Maps. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Vol. IV. *South and East Africa.* Historical and Geographical. With Ten Maps. Crown 8vo. 9s. 6d.

Also Vol. IV in two Parts—

Part I. Historical, 6s. 6d.

Part II. Geographical, 3s. 6d.

Ludlow. *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England, 1625-1672.* Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

Machiavelli. *Il Principe.* Edited by L. Arthur Burd, M.A. With an Introduction by Lord Acton. 8vo. 14s.

Prothero. *Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents, illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.* Edited by G. W. Prothero, M.A. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

— *Select Statutes and other Documents bearing on the Constitutional History of England, from A.D. 1307 to 1558.* By the same Editor. [In Preparation.]

Ramsay (Sir J. H.). *Lancaster and York. A Century of English History (A.D. 1399-1485).* 2 vols. 8vo. With Index, 37s. 6d.

Ramsay (W. M.). *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.* By W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.

Vol. I. Part I. *The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia.* Royal 8vo. 18s. net.

Vol. I. Part II. *West and West-Central Phrygia.* 21s. net.

Ranke. *A History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century.* By L. von Ranke. Translated under the superintendence of G. W. Kitchin, D.D., and C. W. Boase, M.A. 6 vols. 8vo. 63s.

Revised Index, separately, 1s.

Rashdall. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* By Hastings Rashdall, M.A. 2 vols. (in 3 Parts) 8vo. With Maps. 2l. 5s., net.

Smith's Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Edwin Cannan. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

— *Wealth of Nations.* With Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

Stephens. The Principal Speeches of the Statesmen and Orators of the French Revolution, 1789-1795. By H. Morse Stephens. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21s.

Stubbs. Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I. Arranged and edited by W. Stubbs, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *The Constitutional History of England, in its Origin and Development.* Library Edition. 3 vols. Demy 8vo. 2l. 8s.

Also in 3 vols. crown 8vo, price 12s. each.

Stubbs. Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

— *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.* An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. By W. Stubbs, D.D. Small 4to. Second Edition. 10s. 6d.

Swift (F. D.). The Life and Times of James the First of Aragon. By F. D. Swift, B.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Vinogradoff. Villainage in England. Essays in English Mediæval History. By Paul Vinogradoff, Professor in the University of Moscow. 8vo, half-bound. 16s.

Woodhouse. Aetolia; its Geography, Topography, and Antiquities. By WILLIAM J. WOODHOUSE, M.A., F.R.G.S. With Maps and Illustrations. Royal 8vo, price 21s. net.

4. PHILOSOPHY, LOGIC, ETC.

Bacon. The Essays. With Introduction and Illustrative Notes. By S. H. Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-bound. 12s. 6d.

— *Novum Organum.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, D.D. Second Edition. 8vo. 15s.

Berkeley. The Works of George Berkeley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces, Annotations, and an Account of his Life and Philosophy. By A. Campbell Fraser, Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 18s.

The Life, Letters, &c., separately, 16s.

Bosanquet. Logic; or, the Morphology of Knowledge. By B. Bosanquet, M.A. 8vo. 21s.

Butler. The Works of Joseph Butler, D.C.L.; sometime Lord Bishop of Durham. Divided into sections, with sectional headings, an index to each volume, and some occasional notes; also prefatory matter. Edited by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 28s.

Fowler. The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. By T. Fowler, D.D. Tenth Edition, with a Collection of Examples. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

— *The Elements of Inductive Logic, designed mainly for the use of Students in the Universities.* By the same Author. Sixth Edition. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

Fowler. *Logic; Deductive and Inductive*, combined in a single volume. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Fowler and Wilson. *The Principles of Morals.* By T. Fowler, D.D., and J. M. Wilson, B.D. 8vo, cloth, 14s.

Green. *Prolegomena to Ethics.* By T. H. Green, M.A. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Hegel. *The Logic of Hegel.* Translated from the Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Prolegomena to the Study of Hegel's Logic and Philosophy. By W. Wallace, M.A. *Second Edition, Revised and Augmented.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. each.

Hegel's Philosophy of Mind. Translated from the Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Five Introductory Essays. By William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Hume's Treatise of Human Nature. Edited, with Analytical Index, by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 8s.

— *Enquiry concerning the Human Understanding, and an*

Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Locke. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding.* By John Locke. Collated and Annotated, with Prolegomena, Biographical, Critical, and Historic, by A. Campbell Fraser, Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 14. 12s.

Lotze's Logic, in Three Books; of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge. English Translation; edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 12s.

— *Metaphysic*, in Three Books; Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology. English Translation; edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 12s.

Martineau. *Types of Ethical Theory.* By James Martineau, D.D. *Third Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 15s.

— *A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents.* *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 15s.

Selby-Bigge. *British Moralists.* Selections from Writers principally of the Eighteenth Century. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 18s.

5. PHYSICAL SCIENCE, ETC.

Chambers. *A Handbook of Descriptive and Practical Astronomy.* By G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. *Fourth Edition*, in 3 vols. Demy 8vo. Vol. I. The Sun, Planets, and Comets. 21s. Vol. II. Instruments and Practical Astronomy. 21s. Vol. III. The Starry Heavens. 14s.

De Bary. *Comparative Anatomy of the Vegetative Organs of the Phanerogams and Ferns.* By Dr. A. de Bary. Translated by F. O. Bower, M.A., and D. H. Scott, M.A. Royal 8vo. 11. 2s. 6d.

De Bary. *Comparative Morphology and Biology of Fungi, Mycetozoa*

London: HENRY FROWDE, Amen Corner, E.C.

and Bacteria. By Dr. A. de Bary. Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 1l. 2s. 6d.

DeBary. *Lectures on Bacteria.* By Dr. A. de Bary. *Second Improved Edition.* Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Druce. *The Flora of Berkshire.* Being a Topographical and Historical Account of the Flowering Plants and Ferns found in the County, with short Biographical Notices. By G. C. Druce, Hon. M.A. Oxon. Crown 8vo, 16s. *net*.

Goebel. *Outlines of Classification and Special Morphology of Plants.* By Dr. K. Goebel. Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 1l. 1s.

Sachs. *A History of Botany.* Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by I. Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Crown 8vo. 10s.

Fossil Botany. *Being an Introduction to Palaeophytology from the Standpoint of the Botanist.* By H. Graf zu Solms-Laubach. Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by I. Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 18s.

Biological Series.

I. *The Physiology of Nerve, of Muscle, and of the Electrical Organ.* Edited by J. Burdon Sanderson, M.D., F.R.SS. L.&E. Medium 8vo. 1l. 1s.

II. *The Anatomy of the Frog.* By Dr. Alexander Ecker, Professor in the University of Freiburg. Translated, with numerous Annotations and Additions, by G. Haslam, M.D. Med. 8vo. 21s.

IV. *Essays upon Heredity and Kindred Biological Problems.* By Dr. A. Weismann. Authorized Translation. Crown 8vo.

Vol. I. Edited by E. B. Poulton, S. Schönland, and A. E. Shipley. *Second Edition.* 7s. 6d.

Vol. II. Edited by E. B. Poulton, and A. E. Shipley. 5s.

Elliott. *An Introduction to the Algebra of Quantics.* By E. B. Elliott, M.A. 8vo. 15s.

Johnston. *An Elementary Treatise on Analytical Geometry,* with Numerous Examples. By W. J. Johnston, M.A. (R.U.I.) Crown 8vo. *Price reduced to 6s.*

Prestwich. *Geology, Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical.* By Sir Joseph Prestwich, M.A., F.R.S. In two Volumes. 3l. 1s.

Price. *A Treatise on the Measurement of Electrical Resistances.* By W. A. Price, M.A., A.M.I.C.E. 8vo. 14s.

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

London, Edinburgh, and New York

HENRY FROWDE



3 2044 023 331 697

FEB 10 1996

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

SEP 10 1999

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



